New Wine Skins

PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS

Anthony, Alfred Williams

LECTURES DELIVERED BEFORE

THE MAINE MINISTERS' INSTITUTE

AT COBB DIVINITY SCHOOL, LEWISTON, ME.

SEPTEMBER 3–8, 1900

BOSTON, MASS.:
THE MORNING STAR PUBLISHING HOUSE
457 SHAWMUT AVENUE.
1901

E.S

TO

THOSE WHO

IN THE VINTAGE OF CHRISTIAN
EXPERIENCE AND GROWTH
FIND

A NEW WINE

NEEDING NEW BOTTLES.

Contents

THE PROBLEM OF PRACTICAL WORK.

Sociology, the Science of Human Society

I

THE MEANING AND SCOPE OF SOCIOLOGY

BY

REV. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D. D., LL. D.

Author of "An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy," "An Introduction to the Study of Sociology," "The Social Problem," etc.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The Meaning and Scope of Sociology

Sociology belongs to that large class of sciences designated human in distinction from the natural sciences; and among the human sciences it belongs to those which pertain to society, not to isolated individuals.

We shall be the better prepared for the appreciation of sociology if we consider

I. *The Study of Society.*

Man's interest in man is natural. His love of self need but be expanded to become the basis of an affinity with those like himself, especially with those whose kinship is recognized. From the earliest to the latest recorded sayings respecting man we find that, so far as he was at all a student, he made himself an object of chief consideration. The statement that he is made in the image of God gives him the preëminence among earthly beings and entitles him to special inquiry. "Know thyself," written over the entrance of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, was a saying deemed worthy of a divine origin and was heralded as the culmination of Greek wisdom; and its endless repetition by eastern sages and western philosophers, in ancient and modern times, proves in what estimation it is held.

Emphasis is given to the same thought by Pope's epigram, "The proper study of mankind is man," and by that of a French writer, "Man himself is the science of man."

In the past, however, the individual human being has been the chief object of study. Only in recent times society became the focus of attention and the subject for continuous, systematic, and cumulative investigation. It is not meant that society was wholly ignored formerly, but that its investigation was spasmodic and by isolated thinkers. Besides, it was not society as a whole that was investigated, but particular societies or certain phases of society, such as the family, the church, and the state, laws, politics, ecclesiastical institutions, economic conditions, and social reforms. That society in its most comprehensive sense is a web in which these social forms and phases are but the threads was overlooked. Valuable social thoughts are scattered through the centuries in numerous writings, such as the sacred scriptures of oriental peoples, the "Republic" of Plato, the "Politics" of Aristotle, Augustine's "City of God," More's "Utopia," and Campanella's "City of the Sun." But society as a totality and inclusive of all human associations was not grasped, its numerous processes were not explained, and a complete system or science of society was out of the question.

We must distinguish between society itself and the consciousness which men have of society. What society actually is and what men think of it may be two very different things. Society long existed before men reflected on it or were aware of what it is and involves. Even now intelligent men move in society without knowing what social forces they exert and are subject to, and without the ability to define society. Sociology simply aims to make the student fully conscious of the social actuality. All development of knowledge consists in making us aware of a reality of which formerly we were not aware.

Originally men were prone to resort to fiction for an interpretation of fact. Mysteries were explained by accident or chance, a demon or a ghost. It took a long time to get to reality for the explanation of reality. Some peoples pass through a long process of evolution before they learn that every change must have a cause; and until that is learned no real explanation of social phenomena can be expected.

When society did arrest the attention it was not its nature which was first studied; that was the last to be investigated. Men were attracted by social facts, by the benefits to be derived from co-operation in the chase, the industries, and war, by social ranks, castes, slavery, and by natural grouping for various purposes. Practice

precedes science. Notions of right and wrong grow out of experience and result in practical rules before the science of ethics appears; numerous experiments are made by states before Aristotle writes on political science; religious practices precede theology; and the practical movements of society arrested the attention many years before the science of society was attempted.

It would be interesting to trace the slow process by which man learns that law prevails in any department. The failure to recognize the fact that it is found in human affairs was one of the strongest hindrances to the thorough study of society. The reign of law was observed in nature while social phenomena were still thought to be haphazard and therefore unaccountable. Very slowly has the recognition of law in human society become prevalent in modern times. It was only a century ago that Herder wondered whether society is not subject to law as well as natural objects, and therefore an object of scientific interpretation. Vico, Montesquieu, and others were his forerunners in this inquiry. So long as God was believed to shape arbitrarily human destiny a science of society could not be attempted; nor would this be undertaken while the belief prevailed that man's earthly existence has significance only as a preparation for heaven. Secular society was

not deemed worthy of study for its own sake. Augustine regarded it as a product of sin and of alienation from God. With heaven as everything and the earth as of little value, it was natural to concentrate attention on spiritual things and neglect the earthly conditions of man. Besides, personal religion was emphasized to the neglect of social religion; hence personal asceticism and hermit life and the reign of religious individualism.

The multitude of erroneous views to be overcome were not, however, the only obstacles in the way of the deeper study of society. The past social condition belongs to the chief barriers. Society itself, aside from a few prominent social structures, was too little developed to arrest the attention and seem worthy of special investigation. So long as in ancient despotisms the state absorbed society no other association could attain prominence. Voluntary associations were not lacking in Greece; but the state dominated the social life too completely to leave room for great extra-political organizations. Socrates protests that he is innocent, yet refuses to seize the opportunity to escape, and drinks the hemlock because he regards the will of the state supreme and final. Various kinds of societies also flourished in Rome; but the dominating idea of that mighty people was civil power. Not voluntary organizations, but its army, its laws and politics,

gave to Rome its place in history. In the Middle Ages the church often contested the supremacy of the political organization, sometimes ruling the state, sometimes allied with it; but voluntary societies did not become prominent as compared with church and state.

To explain the changes which have taken place in society since the Middle Ages would require a full account of the origin and development of the forces which have produced the modern era, such as the evolution of the modern states from feudalism; the Renaissance, with its revival and spread of classical and especially Greek literature; the invention of printing and its effect on learning; the larger conception of the world and humanity gained by the discovery of America and the ocean route to India; the Reformation; the development of science since the time of Copernicus; and the general enlargement of thought and of human freedom. The church had been divided, so that two great ecclesiastical societies now confronted each other. Travel and the growing intercourse between nations also made other religions than Christianity objects of inquiry. With the American and French Revolutions the people assumed the authority which formerly coerced them without their consent. The sovereignty of the people opened the way for numerous voluntary associations as the embodiment of their wishes and expression of their will.

The church and state were not abolished, but they ceased to have a monopoly of society and were themselves transformed by the growing power of the people.

Taking account of all that led up to the nineteenth century as a preparation for sociology, we must look to that century itself for the conditions which made the science of society possible. Not only have the advances of natural science during that century been marvelous but also obtrusive. Its discoveries were striking, the inventions to which it gave birth have wrought wonders. For a while it actually seemed as if the great study of mankind would be nature instead of man. Scientists like Buechner and Haeckel claim the century for the science of nature, and think that the twentieth century will be the era of social science. But while less palpable and less striking, the progress of the human sciences has been very marked and in some instances may dispute the claim to supremacy with the science of nature. During the nineteenth century the science of language was created. Such progress has been made in history, evolution itself being but one of its phases, that the claim is made that the nineteenth should be called the historical century. Never before has an equal amount of attention been devoted to economics and politics, ethics and theology, and in each the progress has been great. Psychology has become a new science and

education has been revolutionized. Anthropology, ethnography, ethnology, and demography are recent creations. Indeed, if for awhile the science of nature threatened to absorb everything, we are warranted in saying that now the era of the human sciences has fully come, with a marked emphasis on such as treat of men in association.

The nineteenth has been called the century of organization and the era when the power of organization was discovered. The numerous voluntary associations which have arisen give a new significance to society, a wider meaning than as merely inclusive of the family, the church, and the state. In Turkey and Russia the government controls society; in the western states the people as a body or society virtually control the government. In republics the people make the state and determine its management. Societies of all kinds flourish, political, economic, religious, artistic, and literary. Every important idea, interest, and purpose can be made the nucleus of an association. Society has thus received a new meaning, its functions have been increased, its importance has become evident to scholars, and its exhaustive treatment involves much more than ecclesiastical and political discussions.

Even if thinkers had neglected social affairs the masses emphasized them. Socialistic and

communistic theories already appeared during the French Revolution, and since then every enlightened land has witnessed the agitation and uprising of the masses. From France, the land of unrest and revolutionary theories, the leaven spread to England, Germany, and all over the continent. The masses had become conscious of inalienable rights, of the claims of the personality and of the dignity of man as man. Prominent lessons of equality and human worth had their source in the Gospel and were proclaimed from the pulpit. In some of the continental countries of Europe socialism has become so mighty a force that it has been proposed to call the nineteenth the socialistic century.

Deeper and more quiet has been the work of social students intent on the scientific interpretation of society. Comte, inventor of the term "sociology" as well as that of "altruism," laid the basis for the science of society, contributed valuable material for its construction, and gave a strong impulse to its further development. He has been followed by a long list of sociologists in France and other continental countries, in England and America. All past study of society has thus culminated in an earnest effort to construct sociology, the science of human society. Only in a very general way can the present status of the study of society be indicated.

a. Society is now definitely before the student.

This means that to the family, the state, and the church have been added social groups and communities, innumerable voluntary associations, and already beginnings have been made to establish a society of nations. Humanity in its associated capacity has come into view. Ours has been called the "epoch of humanity."

b. The value of society is being realized. In union there is strength. Coöperation, syndicates, combinations of capitalists and of laborers, the union of churches, are regarded as important aids in solving weighty social problems. Legislation is prized as the power of the collectivity to promote municipal, state, and national welfare. Emphasis is placed on social politics, politics based on the needs of society at large, and far more worthy than partisan politics. The individual himself is more and more viewed as a social product, the result of heredity and social environment.

c. The responsibility of society is recognized. Schiller declared our indebtedness to society so great that our utmost efforts cannot pay it. "Society makes criminals," has become a common statement. The slums, the saloons, and all dens of iniquity are created and fostered by communities, municipalities; those who tolerate them share the guilt of their existence. It is now admitted that individual and social redemption involve each other.

d. Society is clearly apprehended as an object of scientific investigation. On this theory numerous valuable works have already appeared, particularly in the French, English, German, and Italian languages. Yet it can hardly be claimed that more than a fair beginning has been made. Sociology is the science of the future rather than of the past.

II. *What is Sociology?*

The definition of sociology as the science of society answers this question only in the most general way. What society is and in what sense it is subject to scientific treatment must be determined. In the next two lectures the nature of society will be investigated.

Like every new science, sociology is still in its tentative stage. In idea, not in realization, is it a science.

The confusion prevailing in the use of the term sociology is bewildering. It is taken in so many different senses as to rob it of specific content and aim. Frequently it is made the receptacle for all kinds of social facts and inquiries. Books and lectures on labor problems, on slums, on sanitation, on poverty and its relief, on legislation to improve the condition of the poorer classes, are called sociological. Sociology has thus come to mean largely social pathology. Even in institutions of learning the term is made to cover a striking heterogeneity of scholarly and practical

subjects. Some phases of the endless variety of social factors or movements are investigated and dubbed sociological. As a consequence, when a writer or lecturer on sociology is mentioned it is by no means clear what he discusses. Perhaps he is a socialist rather than a sociologist.

By defining sociology as the science of society much material is excluded which is generally designated sociological. Social details are essential; but they are studied for the sake of the science they involve. The immediate aim is not practical; but when the science of society has been constructed its application will be of the utmost value for social reform. Indeed, it seems strange that men should attempt the reconstruction of society before they study its nature and the method of its operations.

Society is the subject-matter of sociology. Society itself is to be interpreted, not merely certain forms, movements, and details of society. Social facts are gathered and classified for the sake of explaining the society from which they emanate. Since sociology specializes on society, it leaves to other studies all questions not pertaining to the specific object of its specialization. Its purpose being scientific, it seeks social principles, causes, and laws, and aims to combine all in a system worthy of being called the science of society.

Sociology becomes vast and difficult enough by making the scientific interpretation of society its

aim. But this aim has been complicated by following various side-issues in which the specific aim was lost sight of. Comte, under the influence of a materialistic philosophy, called sociology social physics, and sought to absorb psychology in phrenology, physiology, and biology. Herbert Spencer seeks to evolve from matter, force, and motion, pronounced absolutely unknowable, all that is knowable. Instead of trying to get to social interpretation by means of Comte's "Positive Philosophy" or Spencer's "Synthetic Philosophy," it is more scientific to go directly to society itself to learn its nature. The task of the sociologist is hopeless if, as has heretofore so often been the case, he must first determine what is knowable and what unknowable, what matter and spirit are, and their relation to each other, and questions of monism and dualism, of freewill and determinism, of atheism, agnosticism, pantheism, and theism. The ultimate problems must be left to philosophy or metaphysics or theology, where they belong, while sociology confines itself strictly to society.

The exact meaning of society being the first aim, it must be differentiated from the individual and from natural objects; its idea must be found, its essence must be seized. The problem is: What must be, in order that society may be? In societies we want to discover society, that which is common to all. In the notion of tree there is

that which is found in all trees; in the concept language is found that which exists in every language; the idea of a state is found in every state; and the idea of society is a reality in every actual society. It is foolish, then, to speak of the idea of society as an empty abstraction; there is no association of which it is not a reality. Just as we can study the different existing languages and yet have besides a science of language which gives what is common to all languages, so we can study the separate existing societies, such as the state and the church, and form a science of political and ecclesiastical institutions, while at the same time we can form besides these the science of society which deals with what all specific societies have in common. Botany as a general science treats of the principles of all plants; zoölogy discusses what is common to all animals. Besides this general botany and zoölogy there may, however, be a special botany and zoölogy of New Zealand or Switzerland. Men can specialize on the church or state; but that does not take the place of the science of society which makes what is common to all societies its subject-matter. From the actually existing societies we learn what society is, just as from a million flowers the extract is drawn in order to get their common essence. When once the science of society is attained it will be found exceedingly rich and practically

valuable, because it gives us the essence of all association. Sociology, of course, does not end its inquiries after attaining the mere idea of society; it also aims to learn how this idea is realized in the most significant of the actual societies. The true sociologist does not forget that his specialty is of supreme importance bacause it penetrates and interprets the social actuality.

III. *The Scope of Sociology.*

The scope of sociology limits the aim severely to the interpretation of society, and leaves all other themes to their specialties. It includes all that is socially significant, typical, and characteristic; but because intent on what is essential, it does not lose itself in unmeaning details and endless repetitions. Newton need not observe every apple that falls in order to discover the law of gravitation; the fall of a single apple involves and reveals the law.

Sociology is not the only social science. Social psychology, social ethics, ethnology, politics, economics, history, treat of society likewise. The question has been much debated whether one or all of these could not take the place claimed for sociology. Scholars who come to sociological studies from economics and politics have tried to absorb sociology in their specialty and make it essentially economics or politics. But does any one of the studies named above make society as a totality its subject-matter of

investigation? These various disciplines take certain phases of society and specialize on them, while sociology concentrates the attention on society itself. Sociology is *the* science of society, while in every other case we have *a* social science, or a science of some social phase.

While on the one hand no limited social science can take the place of the general science of society, on the other, sociology does not propose to take the place of economics, politics, history, and the like. Just as the science of language must limit itself to what is common to all languages and cannot make a specialty of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, or French, but leaves these to other specialists; so sociology, treating of what pertains to all society, cannot specialize on economics or politics, but leaves these as specialties to economists and politicians. The economist sees political economy in the industries; the sociologist beholds society in them. The one seeks economic laws and the other seeks social laws.

Sociology thus has a distinct sphere which it shares with no other study. It is not social psychology or ethics or history; it is not economics or politics; but it learns from all. As the general science it can determine their relation to each other, which no special science can do. Between the general and the special sciences a relation of mutualism, of coöperation, prevails.

It has already been stated that with society as its subject-matter sociology cannot turn aside to investigate the ultimate metaphysical problems. Interminable confusion has prevailed because sociology, instead of confining its attention to society and drawing its scientific data strictly from society, was made the receptacle of all kinds of abstruse problems of the human mind. As a consequence, sociology has been regarded by many as too general to have a definite and specific object of investigation. Even social students have avoided the term because too vague and even unmeaning. If made to include all that concerns man it evidently makes impossible demands on the sociologist. It is for these reasons that the scope, the scientific interpretation of society, should be severely adhered to.

Especially has it been feared that sociology may undermine ethics and religion. So long as it confines itself to its proper sphere this fear is groundless. It takes ethics and religion as social factors of great importance; but it does not propose to take the place of ethics and theology. Specialists in these departments can continue as heretofore to solve the great ethical and religious problems without danger that sociology will invade their specialties as a rival. All it does is to treat ethics and religion as social forces and to determine their place in relation to the other

forces. Sociology will help ethics and theology in their search for truth, and they will help sociology in the same search.

Comte emphasized prevision as one of the aims of sociology. He believed it possible to discover the laws of the social processes and by means of them determine the future movements of society. Even in natural science, however, astronomy excepted, scientific prevision is limited. We may know how forces work without being able to tell when, how, in what combinations, and subject to what conditions, they will appear. Human society is so complex and involves so many factors beyond our control, that it is impossible to predict the events of a single day. Even the best economic expert knows how hazardous the attempt to foretell the movements of the stock market from hour to hour. At the beginning of the nineteenth century no one could have told its course, its events, and its final achievements. The appearance of a single personality, like Napoleon or Bismarck, may upset all calculations. Human society teems with inestimable qualitative and quantitative factors. What men will appear, what social forces they will exert, what coöperation and antagonism will prevail, how nature and circumstances will affect human action, all are beyond the power of prevision. A single life abounds in mystery; how much more, then, the life of an organization and the world.

But while scientific prevision is out of the question, some idea may be formed of the general tendency from a study of the forces at work in society.

Even the predictions respecting the ability of sociology to interpret society must be tested by the results. So far as the study of society has led to a consideration of the profounder problems the sociologist has learned many reasons for modesty. It is safest to make social interpretation the aim of sociology without boastful confidence as to what interpretation is possible. The discovery of historical and social laws has been proclaimed repeatedly, when later researches showed that the supposed laws were nothing but rules, the limit of whose application was doubtful. Confidence has in some instances yielded to scepticism, and now it is not unusual to hear the possibility of discovering social laws questioned. The actual establishment of the social science is the only way of proving how far society will submit to scientific treatment. If eventually it is discovered that there are subtle, mysterious, and inestimable factors which cannot be treated scientifically, it is a demand of science itself that this fact be frankly admitted. Every science is limited; every interpretation leaves an uninterpreted and, so far as we can see, an uninterpretable residuum. Theory enters where demonstration fails; but theory must be taken

for what it is worth, namely, as theory. Often what is highest and most deeply concerns human interest lies beyond the province of science, such as spirit, personality, and certain facts pertaining to ethics and religion. An idea may be true and valuable even if its correlations and its exact place in a scientific system cannot be determined.

In order to accomplish its aim, the interpretation of society, sociology is divided into three parts:

I. *The Nature of Society.*

II. *The Evolution of Society.*

III. *Sociological Ethics.*

The first seeks to discover the essence of society or its constituent elements; the second deals with the transformations it undergoes in the process of development; the third, based on the inherent nature of society and its evolution, considers what society ought to be. In the last no less than in the other two divisions the aim is scientific. Sociological ethics discusses principles and leaves their application to the practical social disciplines. The first division aims to find what always must be in order that society may be; the second deals with what society has been in the past and has become through its evolutionary processes; the third, treating of what ought to be, involves the progress of society in order to realize what its idea requires.

II

THE NATURE OF SOCIETY

BY

REV. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D. D., LL. D.

Editor and Author

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The Nature of Society

Words with a deep and broad meaning usually contain both known and unknown quantities. To what is known a plus must be added, and the problem is the discovery of the value of the unknown x. Society is such a word; it is used in common conversation without any conception of its treasures of thought. Sociology aims to make the unknown quantities known.

Heretofore it has been one of the most serious difficulties in sociological inquiries that social problems have too often been discussed without realizing that the nature of society is the first problem that requires solution. Many works on sociology fail in that they give no definite idea of what society is. Some writers seem to think it too evident to require explanation, while others treat it as too complex for full interpretation. We must have society before we can do anything with it, and one of the greatest needs in social study now is a comprehensive and exhaustive view of the nature of society.

The etymology of the word leads us to *socius*, companion, one who shares or partakes of something with another. The fundamental idea in the corresponding Greek *Koinonia* and German

Gesellschaft is that of association. The members of society are associates; some tie unites them, a solidarity of views and interests, or the same purpose and a common sphere of action. The genesis of society from individuals, or what takes place when persons leave their isolation and enter into association, must now be investigated.

Society is frequently called an aggregation of individuals; but this fails to seize what is most essential, namely, the fact of association. A hundred men gathered to view a conflagration, but without any inner bond of union, may be called an aggregation, a congregation, an assemblage, but not an association or society. A sum of individuals in the same place and merely externally related gives no idea of sociality.

A mere aggregation of individuals applies better to what are called animal societies than to human association. Thus animal society is used for herds of cattle, schools of fishes, and birds migrating together. A closer analogy to human society is found in hives of bees and communities of ants. But even in these analogy must not be taken for identity.

Place, physical contact, external relations never constitute human society, but may be important conditions for its creation. That men associate always involves some kind of mental influence on each other. Society involves a giving and taking, not physical, but mental; a

communication of thought or feeling or volition. Whatever physical basis society may have, its essence is always psychical. No relation of men, then, involves association unless they have some mental content in common.

This can be illustrated by showing the difference between the family as a biological product and a society. This difference is the more important because biological and sociological processes are so often confounded.

When a man emigrates from England to Australia or the United States and never again in any way associates with his family, he is not biologically severed from his kin. Nothing can sever the consanguine tie fixed by nature. But he and the family to which he belongs have ceased to constitute a society. When that strange being, Caspar Hauser, was found in Nuremberg every effort to find his family was a failure. Socially he was never connected with it, but its biological unity continued.

Any mental factor that individuals can share with each other may be made the basis of association; but in formal social organizations it is usually unity of purpose which constitutes the combination. Sharing in some degree the same thought and feeling, they concentrate these in some aim for the attainment of which they unite. Such an organization means coöperation. Hence the *will* has been emphasized as the chief factor in social organization.

In this emphasis on the psychological element sociologists are in general agreed. Society does not exist unless there is some kind of mental intercommunication, some partnership in mental content, or a degree of mental solidarity. It has been claimed that there must be a measure of permanence in the relation between individuals in order to constitute a society. We indeed do not speak of men as forming an association if they meet casually; at the same time it must be remembered that men who on a train or otherwise exchange views and impress each other are subject to the very process of giving and taking which is the essence of all association.

In formal organizations, such as the church, the state, combinations of capitalists or laborers, society appears in a definite form and with the most distinct outlines. A specific purpose as the nucleus gives precision as well as unity to the society. But a sociology which confines its investigations to formal organization would miss important social factors. Nor can we exhaust the subject by a discussion of social institutions. Many of the mental processes which take place in society cannot be classified under the head of what is established or instituted or formally organized.

An evening gathering or company is called society. Social and associative factors exist, though there is no formal organization. So there

are social groups and communities which can justly be called societies though not formally organized. It is the mental interchange or subjection to the same mental conditions and influence which distinguishes them from mere aggregations.

Still more evident is it that society is not limited to formal organizations when we inquire into what is meant by social products and how they arise. We call language a social product; likewise traditions, customs, maxims, proverbs; in fact, all that is included in folk-lore. But are these produced by organizations? In their production all have a share who influence each other mentally. An individual or organization may take a prominent part in shaping a language; but in reality it is the product of society as inclusive of all who have helped to mold the language and who are molded by it. That great social inheritance into which each one is born is a growth through many ages to which myriads of persons in all kinds of psychical relations have contributed. However important formal organizations may be, they are but a part, not the whole, of society.

Society, then, embraces all groupings of men between whom mental combinations and interactions take place. Its essence is not organization, but this mental interaction. Between two friends this mental reciprocity and mutuality may

be the most intimate, and they can form society of the deepest and truest kind, all formal organization being out of the question. Indeed, free mental spontaneity furnishes some of the best illustrations of sociality. What is to be fixed upon as fundamental and most essential is that human society involves psychical action and reaction.

The preceding lecture has made it clear that social consciousness is not the measure of the social reality. Men are members of society who have no idea what this relation and its responsibilities mean. We study society for the very purpose of making conscious the unconscious social bonds and processes. There is a society of nations and there is an associated humanity; but who has fully grasped the meaning of these statements? Society depends on actual psychological relation between men, no matter whether it is conscious or unconscious. Recent investigations have made it evident that much which is deepest in society as well as the personality is but feebly if at all apprehended.

I now come to the most radical error respecting the nature of society. So universally is society regarded as composed of individuals, and so self-evident is this thought to be, that no investigation of the matter is deemed necessary. The dictionaries make it consist of a body of men, a union of persons; and without qualification individuals

are said to belong to a society. In view of this general concensus it looks like defying common sense to deny that individuals literally compose society or are its constituent factors. Yet so long as this notion prevails society cannot be understood. It cannot exist without individuals, and all its factors emanate from them; nevertheless it is not a union of individuals, but consists of contributions made by them.

An individual consists of body and soul; do both belong to a philosophical society? Even if we separate the mind as the essence of the individual, can it be said to belong to any society? A man is reported to belong to twenty different societies; but if he really belongs to one he can no more belong to the other nineteen than a dollar can belong to twenty separate individuals.

The matter can easily be tested. Is a church composed of individuals? Has it their minds, their hearts, their wills, their means? There are churches with millionaires in them which nevertheless are burdened with debts and have no reputation for liberality. A church with fifty business men who manage their personal affairs admirably may fail to establish a reputation for business ability and integrity. The fact is that a church has of the mind of the members, of their ability and means, only what they give to it. Much of what they are and possess is devoted to other causes. No church absorbs or wholly

exploits its members and is truly composed of them. Now a church gets more of them, then less, but it never gets more than a portion of them, and usually the fraction is small. In fact, if they were nothing but church members their humanity would be abnormally limited.

That individuals do not compose society is capable of mathematical demonstration. It is an axiom that two things which equal the same thing are equal to each other. Let twenty men be supposed to constitute a scientific association and then form a whist club. The whist club and scientific association equal the same twenty men, therefore the scientific association is a whist club! We need but probe the matter to the bottom to see the absurdity of making individuals the social constituents, and it seems incredible that such a view could ever prevail.

It is no play on words or unmeaning subtlety which is here considered. No less than the foundation and whole superstructure of sociology are involved. The false theory combated has been fruitful of serious perversions. An extreme socialism has drawn the legitimate inference, namely, that, since the individual belongs to society, it can do as it pleases with him. Society simply exercises the rights of proprietor, and the rights of the individual against society are denied. There can be a social despotism which is as despicable as the worst form of individual tyranny.

An extreme individualism is thus opposed by an equally extreme socialism, the one minimizing society, the other the individual. The dignity of the personality is ignored, and it is claimed that there is a social but no individual ethics. The conclusions thus drawn are the inevitable logic of the doctrine that the individual belongs to society.

In opposition to this error I need but appeal to your deepest convictions. There are private affairs which do not belong to society, and which are not subject to social control. In his thoughts, beliefs, and choices a man is free. He may be persuaded, but cannot be coerced. There is something so peculiarly, so absolutely individual, that it cannot be shared. There is within the personality a holy of holies which he only, the high priest, can enter. The individual has as sacred precincts as society; and some things no true man will abandon at the behest of others, though he must stand alone or even die for them. His conscience ceases to be conscience so soon as he ceases to be its keeper.

We have a right to claim that this modern idea of the dignity and sanctity of the personality is the true idea. Unmistakably, then, there is in the individual something which does not belong to society, that which makes him more than a thing and constitutes him a person.

The error arises because we place a full dependence on our senses and fail to exercise our

reason. We see people together and imagine that therefore we have society; but so soon as we think through the subject it becomes self-evident that society is not made by the coming together of individuals, and is not composed of individuals. Society is not seen, but thought.

A society always consists of what individuals give; it is not composed of themselves, but of what they contribute of themselves. Let us call that which they give social force. Society, then, consists of the social forces emanating from individuals, and it is a concentration or union of these social forces. This is its soul; all that is external and visible is but its body.

In the church as a society we have a concentration of the religious force of the members. Not that the church gets the whole of this force; some of it may be given to one of the many voluntary religious associations, while what is deepest in the personality never finds social expression. Some have actually claimed that there is more religion outside than inside of the churches. Nor is the religious force found in absolute isolation in the church. With it are connected other forces, such as the economic, esthetic, and political. An art club is a concentration of esthetic forces; an industrial society is a union of economic forces. Thus the individual, instead of belonging literally to an association, gives to one a contribution of his religious force, to another of his esthetic, to

another of his political, while much of the force in him is private and never given to any society. The individual, therefore, has both private and social forces, and the social ones are given to the various societies to which, in common parlance, he is said to belong.

Now we have the key for the interpretation of society. The task becomes hopeless if in every instance the individuals must be considered. What shall we do in that case with the long prehistoric era in which we have not even the names of the actors? But from the remains discovered we have an idea of the forces then at work. Even in historic times there are long eras in which but few persons are known; but the forces are to some extent known, and from them the history can be constructed. History deals with forces, and with persons only so far as they exert them, while biography is more concerned about the personality.

Every science deals with forces as the essence, and in all cases it seeks to get from objects to the energies inherent in them. In economics the laws of the forces at work are the same whatever persons may exert them. The same is true of politics and of ethics. History is not concerned with the energy inherent in Bismarck, but with the political power he exerted. By concentrating the attention on the social forces, sociology simply takes its place with economics, politics, ethics, and the other sciences.

We now see the value of the statement often made that society is as the aggregate of its units, these units being individuals. If a hundred men meet to form some society, can you tell what its character will be unless you know their purpose? A score of associations may be possible. Sometimes a person gives less of himself to a society, then more, according to inclination and circumstances. In a crisis a society may absorb twice as much of its members as ordinarily. Thus at different times persons belong to a society in different senses; and it is impossible to determine from the sum of the individuals what the character of the society they form will be. What men are as individuals gives no clue as to what they will be when associated, except in the most general way. It depends on the stimuli which come from others, and how the man responds to them. The needle which when free points to the north pole may be changed by a neighboring magnet.

Turn, now, from the unmeaning statement that society is a sum of persons to what it really is, namely, a concentration of the social forces of persons, and the subject becomes clear. Tell me the kind and degree of forces concentrated in an association, and I will explain its character. Make the social forces the units of society; then it is always true that society is as its units. I know what kind of an association men will form if I

know what forces they will unite—economic, political, religious, esthetic; otherwise I can have no idea which of the many possible ones will be organized.

It will at once be seen how complete a revolution is effected in the study of society by apprehending it as composed of the forces which persons exert, instead of the persons themselves. Society always consists of the interaction of the social forces of individuals. When we say that persons combine we mean that they unite their forces for some end. Persons are by no means eliminated; all the social forces emanate from them. They are, however, put in the right place. As rays of light can be concentrated in a focus, so can the forces of persons be concentrated. The focus where these forces meet, interact, coöperate, or antagonize each other, is society.

Difficult as this view of society at first appears, reflection will make it familiar and its truth certain. We can still use the old terms, and say that individuals belong to and constitute society, but it must be with the new meaning. The true idea once fully grasped, we become astonished that we could ever believe society actually composed of individuals.

Some important inferences follow from the above:

Society is not formed by individuals as trees constitute a forest, by means of collecting them

in the same place. It is not formed of them as hydrogen and oxygen form water, being so absorbed that aside from the association nothing is left of them. We must also reject the figure of Herbert Spencer, that society is a building of which the members are the various stones so cemented together as to form a unity. A stone cannot at the same time be walled into twenty buildings, but a person can belong to scores of societies.

Neither is society an organism, literally, of persons—a common view that teems with errors. The individual is more than an organ of society. To be an organ of society in certain communities means to be an organ of the devil. It is refreshing, at a time when the personality is so often degraded, to find an ethical writer who declares that the individual is "the organ of God." He may choose to be the organ of his own ideals rather than of a debased community.

Society is, however, an organism of the social energies, such a union of the social forces that they interact, influence each other. This union may be in the main coöperative, but antagonistic elements are not lacking. As we have seen, these social forces are mental, consisting of thoughts, impulses, purposes which exist in persons, but become social energies by being communicated from one to another.

Each specific society is a unit and has an individuality of its own according to the peculiarity of the forces it contains. A thousand labor organizations are alike in their general aim, yet each has distinctive features, because no two have the same energies combined in the same way.

There are simple social units and there are compound units or units composed of other units. A particular church is a simple unit; a denomination is a compound unit composed of the various churches. So the United States is a unit of units, and a state is a unit composed of townships, counties, judicial, legislative, and congressional districts.

Many societies coexist which are not compounded; they are not dependent on each other, yet each may be affected by the course of the other. All the societies in a free state cannot be regarded as an integral part of the state. A church within the external bounds of the state and protected by it may yet be free to manage its own affairs. There are numerous other non-political associations which sustain the same relation to municipalities and nations. Some churches and scientific societies extend beyond a nation. Socialism, for instance, has formed international alliances. States themselves are leagued together and form a society of nations. In modern times the relations entered into by the different peoples, in one way and another, extend around

the globe and make humanity itself a society in the largest sense. This affords some idea of the vastness of the social relations and the complexity involved in society. Each society is a concentration of social forces, and it, in turn, becomes a social force; societies which are compounded or united are a combination of forces; societies not compounded, but coexistent, constantly influence one another. This great and intricate tissue of forces, each fiber acting on others and acted on by them, is the object of our investigation. Every such force, every society, is not to be viewed merely as it now exists, but as having a past which has made it, and a future whither it tends.

The Individual and Society.

The nature of society will stand out in bolder relief if the relation of the individual to it is more fully explained. A social thinker has declared the relation of the individual to society the most difficult problem of the nineteenth century. Its solution is of practical as well as of theoretical value. This solution will be materially aided by a careful discrimination between the private and the social forces.

A person can be viewed as so much force, part of which is exerted solely for self, unknown even to others, while the rest goes out to others and exerts a social influence. All the force of an individual is personal; but only that part is social which affects his fellow-men. A thought which

remains in the mind of the thinker and an emotion which finds its grave in the heart are not social; but they become so as soon as expressed to other persons. Kepler spoke of the many theories pursued by a scientist of which the world has no conception; Newton is said to have required imagination as much as Shakespeare. But what do others learn of theories finally abandoned by the investigator, and of the imagination which leads to no results? Every life, especially that of the thinker, is vastly richer than the world can conceive. In many instances but a small fraction of the personal force becomes social. An idea or invention which dies with its possessor is private but not public property. A Roger Bacon is too far in advance of his age to be understood by it; that which he alone has and cannot share with others isolates him and makes him solitary. Since only that which is shared is social, we have the strange fact that a man may have wealth of intellect which the society to which he belongs does not possess. A strong individuality is always more than social concensus and social conformity. Much that the prophet hears and sees on his tower may be incommunicable to those not prophets; therefore it cannot become social.

There is a twofold evolution of society: that which is commonly meant by social evolution, namely, the development of existing society; the

other is that which is generally overlooked, the evolution of society itself from individuals. The latter needs emphasis now on account of its importance and its neglect. So long as Crusoe and Friday remain apart no genesis of society takes place. But so soon as they meet, enter into communication, think, feel, plan, work together, society exists. The process is always the same whether two or millions are concerned.

A number of terms taken from the individual and applied to society require explanation. With the same thoughtlessness that we speak of individuals as belonging to society we speak of a social mind, social consciousness, social conscience, social thought, feeling, will. Not one of these really exists; all are mere figures of speech. Congress has no mind; its resolutions, discussions, votes, actions, are always those of individuals. Where is the brain or mind of seventy millions of people to think and act for them? The piety of a church is nothing but the piety of the members. There is no consciousness of an audience except that found in each hearer. Public opinion is but a collective term for the opinions of the individuals who constitute the public or the majority of them. When we speak of thought or feeling otherwise than as found in individual minds we deal with abstractions or use figurative language. A philosophical society cannot think, but its members think.

This removal of myths must not, however, mislead us to suppose that individuals are the only reality and that society is nothing. Men who meet to mingle their thoughts are themselves made different from what they would have been if they had remained alone. Of course nothing can be in society which has not its origin in some individual mind; but if we want to be assured of the reality of social action, look at the state as it exerts its enormous power, or at an army as it fights a battle. In such cases we do not merely consider the mental deliberations or resolutions which are the true social forces, but also the material means they use to accomplish their purposes. The products of society are so different from those of isolated individuals, and they are so numerous, that they testify unmistakably to the reality of society.

We have also the strange phenomenon that an association may decide what is contrary to the preference of each member. The decision is reached for the sake of expediency or out of deference of the members for each other. Individual members of Congress did not want the Missouri Compromise; it was adopted as the mean of concession on the part of the conflicting parties respecting the slavery question.

Some products are so distinctively social that they could never have been created by isolated individuals. Language is but one of many illus-

trations, though the most striking. With nothing but isolated human beings, history with all its treasures would of course be impossible.

As individualism and socialism place a different emphasis on the individual and society, so we find the same contrast in the estimate of history. An interesting conflict has for some time been waged with respect to the place of the individual and society in historic processes. Frequently the great man theory has prevailed, that history has been made by men of eminent ability and exalted position; and the old histories deal chiefly with kings, statesmen, generals, priests, and scholars. The people were not considered of much account, and it is true that they have often been mere clay in the hands of their leaders. But leaders were nothing without those that followed; and whoever may have been the generals, there could be no army without soldiers. Thus rulers and the people must always have coöperated in great historic movements. The leader is, in fact, but a part of the society the glory of whose deeds his personality absorbs. One need but read Carlyle's "Heroes and Hero-Worship" to learn how the great man theory has dominated history. It has too generally been overlooked that a man becomes great in history because, whatever his superiority, there were those who were capable of being led and of responding to his initiative.

Formerly the individualistic view was more prevalent. The masses were treated with contempt. To Nero is attributed the saying that "kings are gods, the people cattle"; and it was eminently characteristic. As late as 1682 the French clergy enunciated this doctrine: "The kings are not only ordained of God, but are themselves gods." Louis XIV wrote to the Dauphin: "There are certain duties of royalty in which we, so to say, being representatives of God, seem to share his knowledge as well as his authority." For Napoleon, who spoke to Metternich with indifference about sacrificing a million lives in battle, it was natural to glorify individual might. He said: "An army of rabbits led by a lion is better than an army of lions commanded by a rabbit," not considering that if ever an army of lions appears it will devour rather than follow a rabbit. This contempt of the people has not yet vanished altogether from Europe.

The social spirit which has come at times goes to the other extreme. It makes society dominant in history at the expense of individuals. It is true that a man is himself dependent on his social heredity and environment; but how he uses these is his own work. He can do nothing that has lasting value without society. What he does only for himself dies with him; what he does for society enters its fibre, lasts while it does, and thus ensures his work an earthly immortality.

To separate the individual from his social surrounding is a false abstraction. He gives and takes; he is made in part by society, society in part by him. The greatest personal force must meet with receptivity in order to be effective. But for all social action the initiative must come from some individual. Not that it is wholly an original creation, for he is subject to social influence.

As the people were formerly ignored, then recently exalted as if not subject to individual initiative, so now we behold a reaction in favor of the power of the individual. In a socialistic era we behold Kierkegaard of Denmark, Ibsen of Norway, and Nietzsche of Germany arise as the apostles of individualism. They want an aristocracy of the freedom and might of the personality. Especially the last demands with a kind of frenzy that the individual have the right to express himself fully, "to live himself out."

It seems incredible that any one should question the historic influence of great personalities. Without its prophets, reformers, thinkers, and generals, history could not have been the same. Why did seven cities claim to be the birthplace of Homer if society is everything and the individual nothing?

The conflict between the claims of the individual and society, individualism and socialism, will last until it is seen that each is wrong if it claims

everything. Their relation is that of reciprocity. Society is nothing without individuals; it has no forces but those which come from them. But as the individual gives to others so he receives from them. The person who is not a mere echo of society but makes original and effective contributions is historic. Ranke says that the great man is not wholly dependent on his age nor independent; but he takes its ideas, makes them his own, develops them in his own way, and then gives them back to his generation. He is receptive, but also original, creative. But of what historic significance is his creation unless there are those who can receive and transmit it?

III

THE SOCIAL FORCES

BY

REV. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D. LL.D.

Editor and Author

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The Social Forces

We have called that which passes from mind to mind and thus becomes the possession of a number of individuals social force. It is the social essence or that which constitutes the substance of society. Let us designate it, figuratively, of course, the mind of society. This mind has the same social function which the mind has in the case of a person; it is the directive, the controlling power. But we can also speak of the body of society. This includes all the visible agencies and physical properties used by the social mind. Society must have means of revealing itself and putting its purposes into action. Societies, governments, for instance, make use of individuals to accomplish their aims; they establish various institutions in which their thoughts are embodied and their feelings revealed. We can get at the social mind only through the external revelations it makes of itself. To study the mind of a community means to study its manifold manifestations, just as an individual must be judged by his words and deeds. No more in the case of society than of a man can we separate the mind from the body; but however intimately the two are connected, it is psy-

chology, not physiology, which gives us the essential characteristics of the individual and of society. This whole subject of the social body, a vast and important realm, is here suggested for the sake of clearness; we cannot elaborate it.

It has been asserted that an army is not a society; it is a force used by a people to protect and maintain their interests. Men and munitions of war and all that belongs to military operations are included, and so far it may be classed under the agencies used by the social mind for its purposes, just as the post-office department with its buildings, or the police force. But, on the other hand, an army may have the same thought, feeling, and aim, these being the conditions for its unity of action. So far as it has the same mind it is a society. What a people thinks and feels and purposes in respect to army operations is as truly a social force in the sense indicated in the preceding lecture, as the religious or æsthetic sentiments.

The social forces of humanity, those mental factors which constantly pass between men and subject organizations, groups, and communities to the same sentiments and purposes, constitute the distinctive features of human association. In proportion as human psychology differs from that of the rest of the animal creation does human society differ from that of animals. The recent creation and development of psycho-physics or

physiological psychology has shown how interdependent mind and body are on each other, the health and vigor of one affecting that of the other also. So through its body society receives influences, and through its body it operates. The influence of physical conditions on the social forces is great, sometimes dominant. Especially in primitive times, when the mind was not yet developed, were the character and the cause of peoples determined by soil and climate, vale and mountain, flora and fauna. A people living inland could not be the same as one on the sea. The Atlantic coast of Africa could not promote the intercourse of peoples like the Mediterranean with its many harbors. Greece was admirably situated for intercourse with other peoples; its geographical position made it accessible to Africa, Asia, and the European peoples. One need but study the relation of physical to social conditions to learn why the early civilizations clustered around or near the Mediterranean, along the rivers Nile, Euphrates, and Tigris, and those of India and China. Excessive heat enervates; it may have been favorable for the beginning of the human race, because it furnished an abundance of food; but where nature does all for man his energies are not developed and he stagnates. On the other hand, in the Arctic regions, where all the time and energy are required to secure a livelihood, no opportunity is given for higher

culture. For civilization the temperate zone, requiring human effort but responding favorably to that effort, affords the most advantageous conditions.

Those persons who are spiritualistic and idealistic are inclined to minimize the influence of the physical forces on society, while those absorbed by natural science to the neglect of the human sciences are tempted to exaggerate them. As mind advances from the state of the savage to that of culture it continually grows in the ascendancy over nature until it completely subdues its laws and makes them minister to human ends. Often a cultured people rises above its natural conditions. Ireland, isolated and in an inhospitable clime, had a precious literature in the Middle Ages when the northern continental peoples, far more favorably situated, were enveloped in darkness. The same soil, climate, and sea where the Greeks developed philosophy and science and gave the world ideals of art, now belong to the Turk. Prussia is amongst the newest of German states, having risen on the ruins of the Thirty Years' War. Its original territory was neither favored by soil nor climate. But the people and rulers have unfolded marvelous energy, and now Prussia stands at the head of the German Empire, and the little electorate has become one of the leading states of the world.

Race undoubtedly has an influence on the social forces; but, unfortunately, we have no way of definitely estimating it. There is no agreement as to what is meant by race, how it is formed, what its exact characteristics are, and what effect it produces. How and when the races originated cannot be determined. Indeed, there is no consensus even as to the number of races, some taking three, others five, and in one case over sixty being enumerated. The whole subject is complicated by the fact that it is admitted that no race is found in a pure state. The various races have mingled and thus produced new types. As a consequence we can trace what are regarded as general racial characteristics, but can hardly claim to go further. The Semitic and Aryan peoples have attained the most advanced civilization. In many respects, however, the Mongolians surpassed them thousands of years ago, and in some departments of economics they may yet rival the most advanced peoples. It certainly looks as if during the twentieth century Asia, with over one half of the population of the globe, will be the centre of interest and development.

It is especially through heredity that the race manifests itself; but it is impossible to determine just what is due to heredity, what to environment, some emphasizing one as the more potent, some the other. The native endowment is due to heredity, that potentiality with which the indi-

vidual starts; but what shall be made of it depends on the family, the natural and social environment, and personal effort. The same native endowment may be developed in various directions under different influences. We can see the final results, but who can trace the numerous and intricate influences to hereditary and environmental causes? Both factors must be taken into account, and sometimes, no doubt, one is more effective, then the other.

When a hen has been sitting on duck eggs and the brood appears, the ducklings, in spite of the stepmother and other environment, rush into the first pond they find. That is heredity. There are at least seven well authenticated accounts of children having been carried off and reared by wolves in India. When they were recovered they were quite wolfish; they often walked on all fours, the sounds they made and their habits, the food they preferred, all savored more of the wolf than of humanity. Generally even the society of the wolves was preferred, and they would escape to them from their human habitations or make attempts to escape. That is the influence of environment.

This must suffice as a hint on the many factors to be considered in the study of the social forces. Numerous interesting points must here be omitted. Among the most important is the question whether, as society develops and the social en-

vironment increases in power, individuality will decrease. The eminent scholar, Döllinger, held that Americans are in danger of making a common level the standard of excellence to the depression of individual peculiarity and originality. Where all are politically equal each is apt to think himself fit for everything, while there is danger that specialization will take one out of the common level. Public opinion may be as great a despot in a republic as is a tyrant on a throne. It is certainly worthy of inquiry, how far the ordinary life in the United States, the education in the common and higher schools, the standard set by the press, by political bossism, and the fashions, is calculated to establish a monotonous level and suppress individuality. Are we intolerant of religious and political peculiarity?

On turning now from the conditions which affect them to the social forces themselves, we see that they are to society what the sap is to the tree. If we want to get from the outward and superficial manifestations of society to the interpreting cause, we shall have to seize them as the soul. Social revolutions and evolutions are the creation and embodiment of the deep, invisible energies of the social mind. Whatever leads us to these forces puts us at the heart. Much as I had read about anarchism I did not understand it until I attended the meetings of anarchists and

came in direct contact with the manifestation of the anarchic forces. There is much more in anarchism than the murders perpetrated by anarchists reveal. Socialism, also, and nihilism can be understood only by those who have their finger on the pulse and feel the heart-beats.

If you give me the forces of a social group or community or church or state or voluntary organization, you hand me the letters which I need but combine in order to construct the literature, philosophy, and science of the association.

We have seen that all the social forces are personal; they consist of what the individual gives of his mind to others. But all the personal forces are not social; many of them remain private, not being communicated to a fellow-man. It is important to follow the personal force as it becomes social. Kant teaches the critical philosophy of which he is the sole possessor, and it becomes one of the great powers of the nineteenth century. The uprising of the Germans to resist Napoleonic tyranny in the beginning of the century has been ascribed largely to the moral influence of the Kantian system. A man feels more strongly a need or an impulse than others; he makes it known, it becomes contagious, and missions, eleemosynary institutions, Sunday schools, and young peoples' associations are established. Thus what is at first a private force may become a social one; the possession of the individual is made the property of the public.

A man can be estimated as a private and as a social personality, the former including all he is to himself solely, the latter his influence on others. Sometimes self-culture has been attacked, as if it meant selfishness. It is overlooked that a man's whole force, whether private or social, depends on his personality. A weak man is weak socially ; but a strong man may be still weaker by concentrating his energies on himself. Great power in society, however, involves a strong personality. If a man uses his energy socially, then the more he has of it and the greater his culture the better for society.

As the person so his forces; in his influence on society he always gives of himself and cannot do otherwise. As thus his personality is involved in the social forces he exerts, is he not necessarily controlled by selfishness or at least by self-interest? An influential school of moralists teaches that self-interest is not only innate, but also unavoidably the controlling factor in all influence.

Selfishness, the effort to make self, particularly the lower self, the source and end of everything, is always degrading. Egotism is based on the falsehood that the egotist is the only worthy object and that others must worship the idol as he himself does. But self-interest has a large sphere of legitimate activity. Attention to his proper interests is the condition for a man's existence and social action. Since all that is dear-

est to him depends on it he has a right, a duty, in fact, to oppose all that interferes with his true interests. This does not imply that there may not be other interests to which his own is subordinate.

Serious difficulties will be overcome by discriminating between a man's self-interest and what he is interested in. Self-interest centres in self, makes the supposed welfare of self the end. A man never voluntarily pursues what he is not interested in; but he can be interested in something else than self; he may prize the truth, religion, a noble cause, or his country above his life. The man who dies for the right because he is supremely interested in it cannot be said to be controlled by selfishness or by self-interest. Two prisoners escaped from a penitentiary in Germany and safely crossed a stream on the ice. The official who pursued them broke through the ice and one of the prisoners returned to rescue him. Could the act which endangered his freedom, perhaps his life, be ascribed to self-interest?

The social forces are not merely developmental, as seed grows into a tree, a chronological process; they also spread in space, diffusively, not unfolding something new, but making more general what already exists. This diffusive process, apt to be overlooked by evolution, includes much that is usually put under the head of progress. By the development of Christianity men generally

understand its spread as a doctrine or system from people to people, not an unfolding of its seeds and germs into the ear and the full corn in the ear. Not a few look with suspicion on the notion that there can be a progress of Christianity in any other sense than spreading its teachings. Even educational institutions often lay the stress on imparting existing information and scholarship rather than on a mental development and a process of investigation which prepare for an advance to a higher stage of intellectual development. The teacher browses, the pupils chew the cud. Therefore it has been said: "Teach to think, not what has been thought."

A survey of human society and its history reveals the fact that imitation has been one of the most powerful of factors. Hume emphasized it and Tarde has written a book to prove its significance in sociology. Sometimes opinions gain a kind of unconscious prevalence, as if by hypnotic suggestion or contagion. Tradition, custom, belief, fashion, testify to the prevalence of the imitative faculty. But its power is usually dominant in proportion to the low degree of mental development. With reflection, criticism, philosophy, and science, its influence wanes. Yet even in an age called scientific there may be few true scientists, while the second and third-rate scientists, to say nothing of the unscientific masses, are mere imitators in the very depart-

ment of science. Imitation is so powerful because it works so subtly and unconsciously.

Viewing now society as a unit composed by the interacting of the social forces of individuals, now working diffusively, now evolutionally, how can we form a clear and comprehensive conception of its various processes? Society is a great ferment, every force acting as a leaven in connection with all the other forces, each of which likewise acts as a leavening power. The very multiplicity of factors at work arrests the attention at first and causes bewilderment, because unity and harmony are not discoverable. Whether we consider the action and reaction, the coöperation and antagonism, the diversity of processes and variety of structures, or the conflicting elements in the content of the social mind, there seems to be no escape from chaos. Our only hope is in such a classification as will reduce to a minimum the various causes acting in society. What is needed is a social analysis which gives all the forces and enables us to apprehend with their aid the endless social processes. It is like an apprehension of nature by means of its elements. But the classification of the social forces has been found exceedingly difficult.

If we are to undertake the task with any hope of success we must first of all find a valid method for determining the classification. There is the psychological method which asks what are the

forces of the individual which become social and lead to association or affect society. When Aristotle and others make man a social being and by this interpret his social relations, we find the statement too general for our purpose. Society is always the product of man's nature and his relation to his fellow-men; but what is there in his nature that impels him to seek companionship? There are needs of his being which only his fellow-beings can gratify, or which can best be satisfied in conjunction with them. Call it affinity, sympathy, love, or what you will, a man needs his fellows for the completion of his own being. Numerous combinations are also formed for utilitarian purposes, to secure a livelihood, to make a division of labor possible, to ward off foes, or to pursue any end which surpasses individual strength.

Another method for discovering the social forces may be called historic or inductive. Societies as they exist and have appeared in history are examined with a view to the discovery of the forces concentrated in them. Thus certain forces appear in every age and become the occasion of important organizations and of permanent social processes. The careful student cannot miss certain human energies which appear everywhere and at all times, and it is these rather than what is exceptional which we seek.

We combine the psychological with the historic method in determining our classification of the social forces.

The universality of selfishness seems to point to it as the dominant factor in the social relations. Men often enter associations for selfish ends which they hope to attain better by organization than alone. The same applies to self-interest; it is frequently best promoted by association. Yet just because selfishness is so general it cannot well be classed as a force distinct from all the rest. It is a parasite of all the distinctive social forces, so that in economics, politics, religion, and art a man can be self-seeking.

The same applies to altruism, the opposite of egotism. It is a kind of general principle affecting all of a man's relations and the exercise of all his forces. Altruism and selfishness are the atmosphere in which the social forces of a personality live, the light in which all their colors appear.

From self-seeking springs vanity, found among peoples of highest culture as well as among savages; ambition likewise, whose effect has had a marked influence on the course of society. The love of honor has been a ruling passion with many historic characters.

Some of the forces are compound, being composed of two or more of the simpler forces. Benevolence may spring from altruism or affec-

tion in connection with ethics and religion. Sympathy is but a form of affection. Numerous other impulses and forces can be deduced from those given in the table below, or can be formed by compounding them.

With this explanation I proceed to give a table of the social forces which find their grounds in psychology and history, and which have been most powerful in determining the relations of men one to another and the cause of social history. Whether or not all social action can be explained by them, they at least interpret the most essential phases and structures of society. I also believe that under this classification can be placed all the social forces.

The Social Forces.

Fundamental,	Protective,	I. Economic.	
		II. Martial,	Militarism.
		III. Political.	
Constitutional, Physiological,		IV. Appetitive.	
		V. Affectional.	
		VI. Recreative.	
Cultural,		VII. Æsthetic.	
		VIII. Ethical.	
		IX. Religious.	
		X. Intellectual.	

The first three forces are called fundamental, because they are necessary for the existence of society and for the exercise of the other forces. Under the economic force are included all the efforts to obtain a livelihood, from the gathering

of roots, berries, and nuts to the organization of the world-market. Men must live in order to discharge the functions of life, and for this reason this force occupies the first place.

The second and third forces are protective as well as fundamental. Men must protect themselves against wild beasts and against their fellow-men in order to establish and perpetuate society. But in society men must protect themselves against each other. The martial force has existed in some form from the beginning, or as soon as different groups of men were brought in contact with each other. In the course of time this force led to the vast military organizations of which such striking examples are seen in our day.

The political force is regulative, and protective because regulative. It fixes the relation of men to each other by law, and thus establishes peace and order. This force organizes the state and government, and uses the military to accomplish its ends. Yet we cannot always include the martial under the political force, because war is much older than the state. The political force for some reasons might be put under the cultural ones, because it appears long after the primitive stage is passed, and involves certain elements of culture—a civil state is evidence of civilization. It is, however, here put among the fundamental forces, because fundamental for society after a certain stage of development has been attained.

The next group of three forces is constitutional; they spring directly from the constitution of men, being a direct expression of what is inherent in him. As they are rooted so directly in his physical system they can also be called physiological, though their operation reveals truly psychological factors. Because a direct revelation of man's nature, needing no culture to express their true character, they can also be called elemental. These forces are found in all stages of development.

The appetitive force is that native impulse to gratification found in hunger, thirst, and the sexual desire. The use of this impulse is evident, since on it the life of the individual depends, and also the continuance of the race. The liability to abuse consists in the excess caused by making an end in itself that which is valuable so far as it is but a means to some other end.

The affectional force includes the affections, such as love, friendship, and all that springs from the native affinity of man for his own kind. It is universal, being found in the savage as well as among the enlightened, though in very different degrees.

The recreative force includes the play-element, amusement, sports of various kinds. It has not heretofore received the prominence which its importance demands. It is found in children and the aged, among the lowest and highest peoples.

In many associations it is a dominant force, and there are communities in which it seems second only to the economic. In the Olympic games it became a bond of union between the independent Greek states; and in modern times it is seen in club life, in athletic sport, in cards and billiards, and in countless entertainments. Travel, summer resorts, and even the saloon belong largely to this force.

The cultural forces require culture for their manifestation, and it is for that reason I have chosen the name. The constitutional ones manifest themselves without culture, freely, spontaneously, immediately. The cultural forces, on the other hand, require some degree of development before their true nature appears. In germ they exist in the most primitive stage, so that they are a development of what is human and not a foreign element grafted on man. But they differ from the constitutional forces in that their manifestation in the savage stage is embryonic and crude, while the appetitive, the affectional, and the recreative forces, in however rude a form, reveal their true character from the beginning. The child exerts the constitutional forces, while only after certain stages of development the cultural ones appear.

The æsthetic force is the realm of beauty and art. In a very rude form it manifests itself among the lower peoples in music, dancing, draw-

ing, painting, and carving. The spontaneous element in art naturally puts it nearest the elemental forces. Its most powerful manifestations have appeared in Greece in ancient times, then in Florence and Rome and France. The most popular and most highly cultivated art now is music, with Germany as the home of its most classic productions.

The ethical element has its realm in morals, its seat in conscience, its culmination in character, and its revelations in life. The ethical factor has its basis in human nature, but is evolved by contact of man with man, and by means of religious influences. In Christianity religion and ethics are organically connected; but in other cases the same close relation has not existed between morals and religion. Often philosophers have developed ethical systems far beyond the morality of the prevalent religions. In the lower stages of culture the conceptions of morality are closely allied to utility; that is held to be moral which is deemed best for the individual and society. The reign of ethics belongs to the future; never in the past have men in general been controlled by ethical principles in their relations to one another.

The religious force, judging from its universality, belongs to human nature. It is doubtful whether any people exists without some religious notions. Travelers have repeatedly reported

such peoples, when later, after better acquaintance, it was found that they had some conceptions of religion. Its non-existence in a definite form among the lowest people would no more prove it not innate than reason or the idea of causality are proved foreign to man because not found in a definite form among some primitive people. The philosopher Herbart declared that religion is more deeply rooted in human nature than philosophy. Not only is religion so universal, but it is also one of the most potent of the social and historic forces. unquestionably arises from man's relation to the universe, though its origin cannot be determined scientifically. That it is the invention of priests or others for selfish ends, or is somehow imposed on man, has long ago been banished as a fiction. The rise of the great ethnic religions in the Orient is significant.

The intellectual force comes last. In some degree it is found in all ages and conditions, and the exercise of all the other forces involves intellect. In the affectional force, however, feeling dominates; in the æsthetic the imagination; while in ethics special prominence belongs to the will, and in religion the entire personality is involved. We need the intellectual as a special force for completeness of classification. We hear of intellect for intellect's sake, and we have in history

intellectualism and rationalism as distinct and marked tendencies. This force creates schools, philosophy, science, and learned academies.

I cannot here follow these various forces through their evolution. By means of development that which is involved in them in their embryonic form is evolved, what is implicit is made explicit.

Every force is capable of an infinite variety of degrees and forms. Economics and religion afford good illustrations. This is not all; no force ever acts by itself or in isolation. Whatever force is dominant in a society, others are in some measure connected with it. Taking now every force, with its differences in kind and degree, and combining it with all the kinds and degrees of the other forces, this gives a glimpse of the endless variety and complication found in society. Forces often antagonize each other; thus the cultural may have to subordinate the physiological in order to develop. Especially is the ethical required to subdue all that is unethical in the other forces that it may gain the ascendency.

These forces give us humanity and history in epitome. They can be used for the study of an association, community, and age. All the forces may be found in a society, certainly all exist in a community and age; the problem then presents itself, what the relative dominance of the forces is. If an age or society is predominantly eco-

nomic, the question arises, what the economic force is exercised for, for the appetite, the affection, recreation, ethics, religion, or intellectual pursuits.

An important study of the ages and communities consists in determining the changes which take place in the relative dominance of the forces. The noisiest and most striking forces are by no means always sure of the victory and of permanence. What is deep and quiet, and in harmony with human nature and ethics and truth, contains the elements of final success. Sometimes a force remains as strong as before, but loses in relative dominance because others are more fully developed. Religion may have lost only relatively in comparison with economics, not absolutely. Once Trinity Church was the most conspicuous object when one approached New York from the sea. It still stands as it did before; but great business blocks now tower above its steeple, and they are seen while it is obscured. The Wall Street it faces and the tide of humanity sweeping down Broadway arrest the attention of the stranger more than the church standing silently in the cemetery of the dead of former ages. The church has not changed, but the world has.

Were a pyramid formed of the constitutional and cultural forces, the former would constitute the broad base, the cultural would occupy less and less space, while the intellectual, truth for

truth's sake, might form the apex. It is in respect to the lower forces that men are most alike, though in degree the difference is great. It is chiefly the cultural forces which differentiate men one from another.

An intellectual apprehension of the social forces is not enough for the study of their operation; it must also be known what feeling and will are behind to impel them. Indeed, every force must be viewed in connection with all the psychological factors it involves. The same doctrine which is now cold, is then fanaticism; now inactive, then promoted with fiery zeal.

The associations formed by each force is important, but each person can trace them for himself. The whole world is covered by economic combinations of various kinds. The martial force is concentrated in the army, the political in the state. The appetitive force is one of the most powerful, but it acts through general society rather than through formal association. But societies chiefly for its exercise exist, though its operations are often in secret. The affectional force rules the family in its best state, though in its lower forms the economic and appetitive forces enter largely into the family relation. Spontaneous as the recreative force is and acting as it has opportunity, it also, as shown above, has formed many associations. All the cultural forces

have been the creators of many societies, such as those of artists, ethical societies, churches, schools, and learned academies.

The use of these forces for reformatory purposes is valuable. In every instance the exact situation must be learned. Let a community be analyzed for the purpose of determining the relative dominance of the forces. A little scientific investigation will soon show how worthless the ordinary opinions on the subject are. Inquiry generally proves a far greater prevalence of economics and the constitutional forces than is supposed. In most communities it will likely be found that money-making and pleasure-seeking, and the gratification of the appetite, leave æsthetics, ethics, religion, and intellect far in the rear. One city of some fifteen thousand inhabitants, which is a college town and favorably situated for religion, was found on thorough investigation to be dominated first by industrial pursuits, second by pleasure, third and fourth by the educational and religious forces.

Often suppression by culture is the most effective method of reform. The lower elements cannot rule if the mind and heart are absorbed by the higher. Some noble substitute for the saloon is the surest remedy for this curse. Error is overcome by the culture of truth, appetite is subdued by the supremacy of ethics and religion. Cut down a weed and it may grow again, but

plant a fruit tree in its place and its end is assured. Is there not an organism of the cultural forces, a coöperation in which each promotes all, and is there not a waste of effort so long as a cultural force is isolated instead of being cultivated in connection with its natural allies?

These considerations make it evident that society need not be controlled by natural selection. It can choose, for instance, the ethical element, and work toward the realization of its dominance. The individual and society can put rational selection in place of natural selection, and make the survival of the fittest mean, not the strongest and best adapted physically, but the most ethical.

A single lecture can hardly give an idea of the wealth of thought in the social forces, certainly cannot exhaust it. What has been said may lead into what has been omitted, if one will take up the subject for further study and for a practical application of the results of the investigation. It is self-evident that we cannot weigh and measure these forces as we do objects of nature; but even if we must be satisfied with mere estimates, they may furnish valuable material for thought and effort.

A study of these forces and of their application makes us painfully aware of a great lack which here can be barely mentioned. We have a science for the accumulation of wealth, but no science of its use. The fruit of economics is left to

haphazard; hence the uncertainty, the folly, we might say insanity, so common in the use, or rather abuse, of wealth. Is there not here room for a great science, the science which determines in what degree industrial pursuits shall minister to the other forces, in order that the true end of life may be attained, the great science of the future?

The Problem of Philosophical Interpretation

IV

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

BY

PROFESSOR F. C. ROBINSON, A. M.,

Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Natural Science,

BOWDOIN COLLEGE, BRUNSWICK, ME.

Science and Religion

A recent writer raises the question as to why a man who studies natural science should be thought specially qualified to discuss and speak authoritatively on religion. He does not answer his query in a satisfactory manner, and neither can I. Indeed, if scientific study, by teaching a man the necessity of confining his thoughts strictly to the matter in hand, or in common language to "mind his own business," tends to do anything, it is, as it seems to me, to unfit one for religious discussion. Science deals with the material, religion with the immaterial. Science deals with the sensual, religion with the supersensual.

It cannot be possible that this right to speak with authority on all things, including religion, has been granted to scientists because they have claimed it! They are too modest for that, at least I am sure chemists are.

I am afraid, however, that in early times scientists were not as modest about claiming things as they are now. There seems to be considerable evidence that far back in the dim past even chemists claimed to know a great deal more than they do now about things and powers gen-

erally regarded as ghostly. One of the most necessary accompaniments of a course in chemistry in those days was the ability on the part of the instructor to raise the devil, not generally, of course, but very particularly, each one having his own peculiar devil, who—or which—came at his bidding.

Indeed, I rather trace back to those times this idea of the peculiar fitness of a man in my profession to speak with authority on religious matters. It is a survival. It should have, and does have, the honor and respect accorded to things ancient. Naturally it has gathered something as it has rolled down through the centuries, the most notable accretions being that we are now thought to be experts in things relating to both God and the devil, instead of the devil alone. But such growth is only natural. Science takes a much broader outlook in every way than it once did.

These arguments are given for what they are worth; candor compels me to say that I do not find them wholly satisfactory, but you may. I wish I could feel that the rest of my argument was as clear as this even.

Now in spite of the fact that there are such good historic grounds for claiming the right to tell you exactly the relations between science and religion, I do not propose to exercise that right at this time. I shall speak of science chiefly, and if what I say has any bearing upon religion I am

sure you will see it yourselves. The fact is, I am more willing to be responsible for your science than for your religion. I do not mean that I have no settled opinion on the matter. I do not intend at this period of my life to attempt the role of the so-called independent in discussing a great question like this. I never have studied much the art of not forming an opinion. I know it is a great art, and much cultivated in these days, but I am afraid I am too old to learn it, even supposing I have the necessary brain power, a very gratuitous supposition, I am sure. Whatever matter I present I hope to present fairly, but I shall not try to conceal what I think of its bearing.

It is but saying what has been said so many times recently that we are almost weary of it, when I remark that the century just closed has witnessed greater advance in natural science than all those which have preceded it.

It is true that when we examine more closely we find that this advance has been more in utilization of principles and forces already known than in the discovery of new ones, but this serves only to modify the statement, not to nullify it. So long as we broaden our horizon I do not know that it makes any difference whether we ascend a hill or an Eiffel tower. But it is almost self-evident that not much of this progress has any bearing upon the question of religion—that is, any direct bearing. Indirectly, of course, it has exerted

quite an influence. The more man's wants are ministered to by application of natural laws, the less need he feels for spiritual ministration. This influence is especially strong upon those whose religious beliefs have contained a large element of superstition. As they have seen one after another of what they have supposed to be evidences in nature of God's actions explained by natural laws, they have been ready to believe the claims of agnostics and atheists that everything in nature is thus explainable. When a man is brought up to believe that God's government of nature is like that of a man driving an ox team, who encourages one with a word and touches up another with his goad as occasion seems to require, it is hard for him to readjust himself to any other conception when that is made to appear untenable. It seems to me perfectly fair to say that discoveries in natural science affect religion only as they relate to the origin and constitution of matter and force, and to the ongoing of things.

What is the last word of science as to these things? Or to put it more modestly and properly, what do I understand to be that last word?

First as to matter, science believes more strongly to-day than it ever has, perhaps, that matter exists. There are no facts with which I am acquainted which tend to show that material things are delusions or lies. We are forced to believe not only in its real existence, but in its

perpetual existence. We know no method or process by which the smallest particle of matter can be created or destroyed. Its form can be changed, but nothing we can do affects in the slightest degree its increase or decrease. This is one of the results of scientific progress of the last century, although it was very early in it that it began to be apprehended.

As to how it exists, we cannot be as positive. We can say that there are, in its lowest elementary form, something less than one hundred different kinds of matter, called the chemical elements, but just what those are we do not know, and are not making much progress in finding out. Some things seem established about them; they are composed of small granules called atoms, so exceedingly small that the imagination fails as completely to comprehend their smallness as it does the distances of the planets and stars. It has been found possible to measure these sizes approximately, and the figures are instructive. Thus a molecule of hydrogen gas is not larger than nineteen billionths of an inch in diameter, and the number of them in one cubic inch at the freezing point of water is about one hundred and ten sextillions, or 110 with eighteen ciphers annexed. If these were placed in a row just touching each other they would make a line extending 32,000,000 miles, or one-third the distance from the earth to the sun. Taking the population of

the world at 1,500,000,000, if every man, woman, and child should pick up a molecule of hydrogen and all put them down in a row, the row would be less than a yard long.

Bear in mind that I am talking now of a molecule of hydrogen, and not of an atom, and that the molecule is made up of atoms, two at least, which are undoubtedly at some distance from each other. The atomic sizes are perhaps ten times as small as the figures given. We must not consider that these granules called molecules and atoms touch each other; science has demonstrated that they do not. More than that, it has shown about how far apart they are in gases at least. Thus the molecules of the gases in the air are distant from each other at least fourteen times their diameters, at common temperatures. This is a small distance when we consider how small their diameters are—.000000019 of an inch; but when we compare it with those diameters and with other space relations, we see that they are relatively a good distance from each other. Thus the moon is about thirty times the earth's diameter from the earth. If the moon were brought into about one-half her present distance, she would be about the relative distance from the earth that the air molecules are from each other. The molecules of solids and liquids are nearer together, but there is every reason to believe that they are very far from touching. It is scientific-

ally safe to say that, taking the earth as a whole, the matter or material of it occupies only a fraction of the space it takes up; that is, that another earth, and probably several of them, could be put in with ours without making it any larger.

Science says further that these granules are not quietly resting in their places, but are in constant motion. The particles of the air are flying about among themselves with the greatest rapidity: they travel about one thousand feet per second, and in doing it hit each other constantly. In fact, each air molecule hits its neighbor about five thousand million times a second. Not only do they move in straight lines with such prodigious velocities, they also have other motion, as of rotation and vibration, that is, of turning round like the earth, and going back and forth like a piano string or tuning-fork. No means has been found to determine with any accuracy the time of rotation of an atom, but it is evidently faster than that of any known heavenly body. One calculation shows that while light, which travels, as is well known, 186,000 miles per second, is moving one-millionth of an inch, a hydrogen molecule turns around once. It can be shown with greater accuracy that gaseous molecules vibrate, say five thousand millions of million times a second.

Of course I know that these figures mean but little; we cannot comprehend them. Do you ask me now what matter is? If so, you see why

neither I nor anyone else can answer. Even supposing we could see an atom or molecule, the difficulty of inspecting the details of a locomotive while it was passing at the rate of sixty miles an hour would be as nothing to that of inspecting a moving molecule. It would seem that when the microscope has been increased in power one thousand times at least, and some means has been found to stop them, we shall be able to see atoms. When we come to consider further, however, that if an atom stopped its motion it probably would cease to exist and disappear, the outlook for ever seeing them is certainly not encouraging.

There is a general rather ill-defined notion abroad that science has extended its knowledge back to certain simple forms of matter, and that these bear the same relation to more complex forms that the bricks of a building do to the completed structure. The fact is, on the other hand, that what we call the elemental forms of matter are really the most complex and difficult to be understood of all things in the universe. Every additional fact we learn about them increases the difficulty of comprehending them. I can understand a man better than I can an atom. Indeed, I think the whole process of evolution has in one sense been misunderstood. There is a very real sense in which it is not the elaboration of the complex out of the simple, but the simplifying of the complex. We may speak of a complex build-

ing being developed out of the simple pieces of wood and bricks and metal, but not of a man as developed out of simple material atoms, because there are no such things. It is so all through inorganic nature also. As I have witnessed the formation of such common things as water and salt from their chemical elements, the thought has come to me, again and again, how much easier it is to comprehend them than to understand how the given elements could form them! We see the things done so often that it seems a matter of course, but consider for a moment the properties of two such elements as hydrogen and oxygen, and sodium and chlorine, and conceive, if you can, how it is possible that they can form water and salt. It is comparatively plain when we inspect the organs of an animal body to see how each part has a certain office to peform, and all combine to do the work required, but the farther one goes back in nature the harder it is to comprehend how the parts contribute to the results obtained. When we chemists come to deal with what are generally called the complex compounds of organic chemistry, we begin to see the function of some of the elements or radicals in the compounds, but we have not the slightest idea of the function of the sodium in the salt. In this sense, when we say that salt is a union of sodium and chlorine, we give about as complete a definition of it as the boy did when in answer to

his teacher he said, "Salt is what makes potatoes not taste good when you don't put any on."

Of course there are theories as to what atoms are, but no one of them makes them any less complex. I shall refer later to some of these. It is enough for my present purpose to make the single point that as far back as modern science has carried its investigations upon matter and its origin it finds increasing support to the simple statement, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The very beginnings of things are so complex and yet so wonderfully adapted to the work accomplished that they could have originated only from an intelligent power and will of superhuman order.*

The development of an animal from an egg is a further illustration of this point. From a physiological or anatomical standpoint the egg is relatively simple, but when we come to consider the qualities which it must contain, which are brought out as the individual develops, we must recognize its infinite complexity, and see that such develop-

* The recent work of Prof. J. J. Thompson is a striking confirmation of this idea that the atom is exceedingly complex. By experiments conducted on X-ray and other electric phenomena, he is led to the conclusion that what we know as the chemical atoms are composed of at least a thousand distinct and of course smaller corpuscles. His views do not do away with our present atomic hypothesis rightly held, but show that besides the magnitudes called molecules and atoms, there is a third magnitude almost infinitely smaller. Modern chemistry has never taught that atoms are indivisible, but only that as yet they have not been divided. The possibility of such division has been freely recognized. Prof. Thompson's experiments simply make that possibility a reality.

ment is really the unfolding and simplifying of the complex. So a machine constructed is simpler than the same in the mind of the inventor. This same idea may be followed out in any direction, and will, I think, be found always true. There is much valuable information from the study of each wheel of a machine, but we really only comprehend the machine after they are all in place and moving together as the maker intended. The whole is simpler that any of its parts. We speak of judging the present by the past, but we make more accurate judgment of the past by the present, for the present is a development and simplifying of the past. No one can rightly claim that things in the universe are yet simple and easy to be understood, but I have a most profound conviction that whether we regard the physical, mental, or moral world, or all together,—regard them, I mean, in the broadest possible way,—we cannot but be convinced that all are working towards simplicity, and this to me is overwhelming evidence of Divine plan in it all.

But it is to our knowledge of force and energy that the past century has contributed most. The most profound and far-reaching contribution is the final establishment of the principle of the persistence of force, more generally called the conservation of energy. In all the preceding ages of the world and down to the middle of the last century force was looked upon as something apart

from matter, working on it but not necessary to it. Its generation and destruction were not doubted. The experiments of that gifted New Hampshire Yankee known in scientific literature as Count Rumford of Bavaria gave the first data which led to the overthrow of the earlier ideas; but, as is generally the case, the full bearing of his experiments in changing work to heat was not seen until many years after he made them. The idea was too great and novel to be grasped at once. Rumford himself only grasped part of it. It was only after Davy, and Faraday, and Joule, and Mayer, and Helmholtz, and many others had contributed their work and thought, that it obtained complete recognition.

It is now seen that force can no more be destroyed than matter, that it is a part of matter. We know it in different modes of manifestation as heat, light, electricity, magnetism, chemical affinity, etc., but these are but manifestations of the atomic movements already referred to. If one disappears in the slightest degree, an equivalent amount of some other appears. We cannot say that matter and force are identical, but we can say that the destruction or creation of the one involves that of the other. The best way of summing it all up is to speak of the "persistence of substance," the word substance including matter, force, and energy. Neither the raising of my hand nor the turning of the mightiest mill-wheel

adds in the slightest degree to the force in the world. It is all a perfect compensation; what one gains in motion, another loses.

Of course the full comprehension of this law can come only when we learn to recognize motions not apparent to our ordinary senses. When a rifle ball strikes a target, or a hammer an anvil, the visible motion of each is destroyed, but what actually happens is that the motion of the countless millions of atoms and molecules of the target and anvil is correspondingly increased.

No scientific discovery seems to have such an important bearing on religion as this. Its first announcement shook the very foundations of religion as they had been built up in the minds of many, and when its application was made to the forces connected with human life and growth, and its apparently perfect working there also was proved, very many of such foundations were completely overthrown. If it does not actually banish God from the universe, it seems at first thought to do so. If all the force I generate as I go on living and thinking actually comes from the food and water and air I consume; if there is no movement without oxygen and "no thought without phosphorus," as Moleschott put it,—what need of longer keeping up the fiction of God working in me, or that there is such a thing as a soul? What wonder that Tyndall, the great physicist, should exclaim, "I see in matter the promise and

potency of every form and quality of terrestrial life!" Materialism had always been a cherished belief of many, but the law of persistence of substance seems to give reasonable ground for such belief, even if it does not make it an intellectual necessity. Haeckel, in his recent book, "The Riddle of the Universe," accepts such a belief as necessary, and tries to show how a certain amount of comfort can be obtained from it.

The Religionist may insist that the original atoms of matter must have been created by Divine power, but if there is no further evidence or need of that power in the universe, he might as well give up his God altogether.

The question turns, it seems to me, on this point. Do matter and force explain everything in the universe? If they do, the materialistic position is impregnable from a scientific standpoint, at least. Of course, if we include the sun and planets in the universe, as evidently we should, we must believe that what we know as matter is but an insignificant part of the whole. For millions upon millions of miles there can be no matter at all. The earth plunges along in its orbit with not the slightest evidence of retardation or friction. This could not be if space was filled with the slightest trace of what we know as matter. Furthermore, we saw when considering atoms that even in the solidest material things these cannot touch each other, but are at consid-

erable distances apart. Taking the earth as a whole, I suppose that if all material atoms touched each other, the resulting mass would not be more than one one-hundredth of the present size of it. That is, at least one hundred times as much matter could be put into the space the earth occupies. But what is now in that space? There must be something. It is meaningless and unscientific to say it is a vacuum. The old Greek philosophers could speculate as to whether nothing could exist, but we cannot. Here, then, is by far the larger part of the universe which matter and force do not explain! But we do not leave it alone; we imagine it as filled by what is called the ether, or if not filled, to contain this ether. This becomes to our imagination the medium of communication between atoms, whether as near as in a piece of iron or as far distant as the sun and stars. This is not another kind of material or matter, for there is only one of all the properties of matter which we can prove that it possesses. It has no weight, no atoms, no attraction, no friction, and the only thing in which it corresponds to matter is its property of taking a stress or strain. It is wholly bewildering to attempt to compare it with matter. Thus, impulses are transmitted through material things in proportion to their rigidity; sound travels through the air at the rate of one thousand and ninety feet a second, but through a bar of tempered steel ten or fifteen times as fast; but

an impulse travels through ether at the rate of 186,000 miles a second. This implies a rigidity far in excess of the hardest steel, but yet the earth plunges on through it, pushing it aside without the least friction, and we all remember the old experiment showing how in a vacuum, which is by no means pure ether, a feather is no more retarded in dropping than a piece of lead.

One of the most ingenious theories of the constitution of material atoms is that they are formed of portions of this ether, moving with what are called vortex motions, such as the rings of smoke have when ejected from orifices by sudden impulses. This has been called the "doughnut theory" of atoms, although it has been recently so modified that instead of reminding us of that simple article of food of Yankee manufacture, it is better typified by the German pretzel. I have no intention of throwing any discredit upon the theory of these comparisons. As Serjeant Buzfuz said about the warming pan, "the doughnut is an article of household economy to be treated with the greatest respect." The main point is that between the material atoms there is a space filled in some way, a world many times larger than the material one, into which as yet hardly anything but our imaginations have penetrated. Of what is going on there we can have but the slightest conception.

It may not be so easy to show that there are forces in nature as little amenable to the laws of the conservation of energy as the ether is to the laws of matter, but a good many scientists are convinced that such is the fact, and the conviction is certainly spreading. Indeed, it seems to me that the law of the persistence of force has been and will continue to be one of the greatest aids in establishing on the firmest foundation the belief in a distinct, vital, intellectual, and spiritual power. The very thing it was supposed to destroy it actually preserves.

Let us look at it for a moment. If I swing my hand through the air, the energy I create comes from the destruction of tissue within my body. My heart beats a little faster, I take in a little more oxygen in the form of breath; in short, gain at one point is accompanied by equivalent loss at another. If I stop my arm-motion by a blow upon the desk, the desk takes up the motion thus stopped. It is the same thing in the inorganic world. If I throw a piece of zinc into sulphuric acid it immediately begins to dissolve and the liquid grows hot, but if I connect a strip of copper to the zinc before putting it into the acid and then bend the copper and put the other end into the acid also, the zinc dissolves as before, but there is less heating of the liquid because a certain part of the heat is changed to electricity and circles round through the liquid and the copper strip. I

may get my force all as one kind or as several kinds, but I get it all; not the slightest trace is lost.

Now no one will deny that thought is a distinct power. If we measure it by what it accomplishes it is the greatest power in the universe. Does it come under this law of conservation of energy? The materialist answers yes at once, for is it not always accompanied by physical actions—movement of blood to the brain and destruction of brain tissue? That may all be, and still it does not answer the question. Rush of blood to the brain and destruction of brain tissue are sources of energy in the form of heat and electric currents. Now if thought is a material force its exercise must have some effect on this development of heat and electricity. If we have more thought we should have less heat, and conversely. But there is no such relation. The changes in the brain with thought are just the same as without. The destruction of tissue there follows the same law as to heat development that it does in any other part of the body. It is true that when a man is engaged in hard mental work he requires more food, but the oxidation of that food gives the same amount of heat with thought as without it. Hence Simon Newcomb says, "All the force taken in in the form of food is expended in the production of heat and muscular action; there is nothing left to be transformed

into thought." And John Fiske says: "Such reduction [of thought to molecular action] is utterly beyond the bounds of possibility; the dynamic circuit is absolutely complete without taking psychical manifestation into account at all."

One other thing shows how entirely outside the law of conservation of energy mental power is, and that is the very different results following the same expenditure of materials. We have no reason to suppose that Shakespeare required more than his regular three meals a day while he was writing his immortal works. Without any disrespect to the various poets who have begun already to prepare for those "times of outpouring" which come in June of each year, I have little doubt but what their brain waste will be fully as much as was that of John Milton during an equal time while writing "Paradise Lost."

What erected the massive piers and swung out over the river the great Brooklyn bridge? Not the steam engines and moving muscles of certain men, but the brain power of John A. Roebling, and yet probably very many of the common laborers upon it were suffering as much brain waste from a physical standpoint as he.

We cannot escape the conclusion that there are forces of the greatest consequence in the world not governed by the laws of conservation of energy, but penetrating and interacting with forces which are so governed even as the ether penetrates and interacts with matter.

Once grant also that such forces exist, and there is the strongest of reasons for believing that they also persist, or are indestructible, like all other fundamental things in nature. And here it seems to me that science strengthens greatly, even if it does not absolutely make sure, the hope of intelligent immortality. That I am not alone in this opinion, let me quote from a recent article by the eminent engineer and scientist, R. H. Thurston, who writes as follows: "There is evidently a law of persistence of all existence, whether of matter, force, energy, or organic vitality, including intellectual and soul life."

Now this idea of the persistence of all existence, which is, I think, one of the greatest truths ever enunciated, requires quite careful consideration or it will be misunderstood. It means simply that all things which are fundamental and unchangeable here will forever remain so. It makes immortality a scientific necessity, but not immortality of things as they are. A piece of wood exists and will exist forever, not however in its present form; it is absurd to believe that, for throw it into the fire and that form is destroyed forever, but the material atoms of which it is made are not thus destroyed and never can be. They may go to form other pieces of wood and doubtless will, for nothing is more interesting in nature than the economical using over and over again of the same materials. I repeat, immor-

tality of matter from a scientific standpoint is the immortality of atoms and not of atomic structures or compounds.

The same is true of persistence or immortality of the forces of matter. We cannot create or destroy any one of them, but can change them indefinitely. We cannot scientifically believe in the immortality of any particular amount of heat, any more than of the piece of wood. It may be heat now, and electricity to-morrow, and light the day after. Only those fundamental atomic movements which are back of all these forces are forever the same, and hence immortal.

Now if those forces which go to make up the intellectual and soul life of an intelligent being are, like those other forces, dependent upon and leaborated from atomic vibrations; if they are mutually convertible into each other and into other forces of nature; if they follow the great principle of conservation of energy,—then they are immortal only as light, heat, and electricity are immortal, that is, as primary atomic motions, and annihilation of the individual results. But as I have already said, or implied, there is this great difference. Intellectual or spiritual or soul power, call it what you will, is not convertible into anything else. Material changes accompany its action, but there is in no sense a conversion of the one into the other. Consider the matter of thought, how unchangeable it is; no matter what it does it

remains the same, or is even increased. If electricity does work, you have so much more work done, and so much less electricity. Not so with thought; whatever it does, itself remains undiminished. The organism through which it acts may suffer exhaustion, but thought itself once manifested can never be destroyed. I am trying to speak in a strictly scientific manner in this. I am not trying to warp or bend facts to support any particular theory. I am forced to this conclusion. Show me any facts of science which are against it and I am ready to modify my views.

Of course I must believe that things unchanged and unchangeable will remain so. If an individual owes his individuality to his intellectual, spiritual, and moral powers; if his bodily organs are merely repetitions of those of all his fellows; then though these latter decay and go back to their original elements to be used over and over again perhaps, individual immortality is his by the persistence of those powers which cannot be destroyed. Whether these immortal powers and forces can be changed after they are separated from material atoms by the death of the individual is a question of a good deal of interest, but one upon which science has little to say. Analogy alone would lead us to think that they could not be. So far as we can see, while their existence is not dependent upon matter, their development is. This question naturally suggests

that other one as to whether they are ever again associated with matter, that is as to a bodily resurrection. What has already been said answers this to a certain extent. We have seen that the same material atoms are doubtless used again and again, but we have also seen that there is an infinite amount of ether from which the material atoms were possibly made, and if enough matter was actually created to provide bodies identical in every respect for all the races of men who have ever existed, and animals too for that matter, it would have no perceptible disturbing influence on the present structure of the universe. Of course this would seem to necessitate either a resurrection at some time in the future or at some other place than on this earth. These ideas are not advanced as arguments for a bodily resurrection of either kind, but only to show that science is not able to speak positively on such matters. One of the most incorrect notions held to by many is that science has proved that a bodily resurrection, as well as many other ideas advanced by religious teachers, is impossible. I wish simply to correct such notions. Natural Science, like all other sciences, gets the credit for proving a great deal more than it ever has proved.

There are various other side paths which we could take here, but all would lead us too far afield. One of the most suggestive, perhaps, leads in this direction. If individual material

atoms may have belonged to several bodies and hence immortality of the same bodies or even re-creation of the same bodies from the same atoms is impossible, would the same principle apply to the intellectual and spiritual powers? Would the immortality of an individual depend in any degree upon whether he had actually created or allowed to be created in him a distinct individuality? If all that makes him up here really originated with some one else, if by no exercise of his powers has he accomplished anything which can be called individual, is there any individual to him? Doesn't he really belong to someone else or to several others, and will not it end thus? Is there not a suggestion of this in the parable of the talents and the unfruitful fig tree? It seems to me that this thought is far more important than that of a bodily resurrection.

But there is one postulate of religion which has not yet entered to any extent into my argument. It is that of a God ruling and guiding the universe he has made. All that I have done thus far is to show that there seems to be a scientific necessity to believe that such an intelligence created matter and force in the beginning, and that there is plenty of space in which he can work now without disturbing the fixed laws of matter and force. All that I have said about immortality has no necessary connection with him at all as a guiding force in the on-

going of things. What I offer on this point I put forth with many misgivings. My special training in science has not fitted me to discuss it. My attention is taken up almost wholly with matter and the forces which are governed by the law of the conservation of energy. These forces are not modified in the slightest degree, so far as I have ever found, by any outside influence. If I prepare the proper materials and arrange the conditions for a certain result to take place, I do not believe that that result will be modified by any influence, however mighty. Thought cannot create heat any more than heat can thought. I do not wish to pass a snap judgment on so-called psychic power. It very likely has its field of operation, but I do not think that field is a chemical laboratory. There are "unfavorable conditions" in such a place, which are hard to overcome.

But I can see the possibility of guidance without the breaking of law. I am willing to go further than that. I cannot understand at all how the earth came into its present form and condition without such guidance even before an intelligent creature had made his appearance. It is all very well to talk about evolution, and chance arrangements, and the influence of environment, and the survival of the fittest, but if the game was not played with loaded dice, so to speak, then no game ever was. As Prof. Shailer says in his recent work, "The Individual," a player may

throw "double sixes" once in a while without comment, but when he does it every time the stakes are piled high, and to fail to do it would lead to his ruin, we have reason to suspect that he knows how. Nothing can be clearer than that there must have been many critical points in the progress of development where it was just as easy to develop away from man as towards him, but at every one of them the right move was taken. And if there was guidance at certain points there probably was all along. Professor Japp, the eminent English chemist, has pointed out in a recent address how even in unorganized matter there is evidence of intelligent direction of forces of development. It is in the case of the so-called optically active substances, of which sugar is an example. These compounds begin to be suggested in certain crystals, and appear abundantly in vegetable and animal compounds; indeed they seem peculiarly necessary to such structures. The peculiar effect on light seems to be due to lack of symmetry in the arrangement of certain of the atoms in the molecules. Professor Japp shows quite conclusively that chance arrangements of atoms would always give symmetry, and never asymmetry; intelligence alone can cause lack of symmetry. Hand-made articles are never just alike, and there is something in us which prefers them just because of that fact. If humanity was the product of chance forces work-

ing upon matter for countless ages, by this time every one of us would have been an exact counterpart of every other one, whereas we know that even in our bodies, the development of which was largely influenced by the action of fixed laws, there is great lack of symmetry of parts. In short, the actual outcome, the highest and last product of evolution or development in nature, is the individual, which in its lowest as well as highest example differs from every other one. Nature emphasizes differences and not uniformity. This point may easily be misunderstood. The individual which nature tends to develop is not the antagonistic type, but the harmonious.

The first marked examples of individualization in nature are the crystals. These have sharp angles and edges. We find them here and there where the soil has been removed and the bare rock exposed, and they form beautiful specimens for our cabinets. We recognize them as survivals of past and primitive conditions. Most of their companions have long ago been disintegrated and converted into soil from whence have come the less angular and more harmonious and higher individuals of the vegetable world, which in turn are used in developing the still higher individuals of animal life, which, with their added powers of locomotion, must be still more harmonious in their individualization. But nothing is more interesting in nature than the

survival in higher forms of characteristics of lower. So this power of individualization by crystallization extends on; recently it has been found that even blood and the white of an egg can be crystallized. So, under peculiar conditions, human individuals, the highest of all, may develop antagonisms instead of harmonies, may grow angles and corners and sharp edges like a crystal. The most curious part of it all is that they think they are types of the highest development possible, when really they are but reversals to the old crystalline type, and, like the human appendix, are of no conceivable use and may cause a good deal of trouble. As a rule the body politic is better off when they are amputated.

It seems to me, then, that this development of the individual to the highest state of mental and moral perfection is plainly foreshadowed, and with this all the facts of science are in accord; and here is where science is in the closest harmony with religion as portrayed in the Christian system, at least.

When the doctrine of evolution was first formulated it was objected to strongly by many Christian believers as being impossible because subversive, as they thought, of their belief. Many still think so. But truth is never subversive of truth, and it is now being seen that, like the fact of conservation of energy, evolution

rightly considered works not harm, but good, to religion. We now see that evolution began when the atoms of matter were created, and has gone steadily on until the present, and will go on for an indefinite future. It has gone on, I believe, in three great epochs or divisions, two of which have been completed. The first epoch was the development of inorganic compounds up to the organic; the second was the development of organic structures ending in man's body, which in its perfect state marks, I believe, the end of bodily or material development; the third epoch began when mental and spiritual powers first appeared, and this is the all-important and uncompleted living evolution of to-day.

Each of these epochs has begun and gone irresistibly forward in obedience to the law which we call the survival of the fittest. It is a mistake to suppose that this law first appears in vegetable and animal life. Its operation can be seen as far back as the elements themselves. It is more than likely that those blanks seen in the table of elements when written in accordance with the periodic law, will never all be filled by the discovery of new elements, but that they represent elements not able to keep their identity, and so blotted out and merged into others very near the beginning of things. Nothing is more common than to find whole series of possible compounds in like manner unable to maintain themselves in

what may truly be called the struggle for existence among inorganic things. Of course we are all familiar with this law in its operation in plants and animals.

It is no less active in mental and spiritual evolution. Owing to the unchangeableness of mental and spiritual power already referred to, we cannot so follow to destruction in this world failure to make gain in these powers as we can in material evolution. That is, we cannot in case of individuals; but no fact seems clearer than that nations and peoples who have failed in these respects, especially in spiritual development, have been blotted out. It has seemed to make no difference how much temporal power they have acquired, how many magnificent monuments they have raised; if they have added nothing to that progress towards the highest spiritual development they have gone down as surely as the thousands of forms and orders of plants and animals which stood in the way of the ongoing of material evolution.

We are seeing also that evolution or development has gone on by the action of two great principles, internal forces and external stimuli. The immediate followers of Mr. Darwin saw clearly only the first of these, or recognized the other in a narrow sense under the name of influence of environment. But it is now coming to be recognized that there must have been a general

guidance of development far broader than physical environment. I have already referred to some evidences of this even back in the period of inorganic evolution, but it naturally comes out stronger and stronger as the higher stages of development begin. John Fiske accepts the necessity of this in his recent book, "Through Nature to God," and it is certain to play a greater and greater part in the future study of evolution. It seems to me that it is the one thing needed to lift up and broaden the whole matter; to change the evolutionary philosophy from one of despair to one of hope; to make it possible for an evolutionist to be an optimist rather than a pessimist.

Read Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe" and see to what a lame and impotent conclusion he comes. At times he "whistles to keep up his courage" like a boy going through a lonely wood at night, but the only solution he offers for the riddle makes it even more of a riddle than before. Compare his ideas with those of Fiske and the school of broader evolutionists of to-day and note the difference; and note above all things that their views are, strictly speaking, as scientific as his, and I believe more so. No philosophy has ever made great progress that was not optimistic at bottom, and none ever will.

In bringing these rambling remarks to a close I will not attempt to sum them up. If I should do

so I might be led into making stronger statements as to what my argument seems to prove than would be justifiable. The trouble with too many discourses on this topic has been that statements too strong and positive have been made by extremists on both sides. Defenders of religion in their zeal have been too fond of giving the impression that the old Latin Church fathers meant to convey when they prefaced their remarks with the phrase *non ego sed dominus*, this is not my opinion, but that of God; and scientists in their reply have put the *ego* in place of the *dominus* in an equally authoritative manner.

I am inclined to agree with Lord Bacon when he says, "To seek divinity in philosophy is like seeking the living among the dead," but I also believe that philosophy is not nearly as dead now as it was in his time. The religious notions a man holds will always be held very largely by an act of faith, but to me at least it is the source of the greatest satisfaction that the more I know of natural science, the more I look into the laws of nature, the more especially I consider these laws as a whole, the more my Christian faith is strengthened, and the more fully I can understand and enter into the thought of the poet:

"And so in seasons of pleasant weather,
Though inland far we be,
Our souls get sight of the eternal sea
Which brought us hither;
Are in a moment carried thither,
And see the children sporting on the shore,
And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore."

V

HERBERT SPENCER AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY

REV. C. S. PATTON, A. M.

Pastor of the University Congregational Church

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

Herbert Spencer and the Christian Faith

The pre-eminence of Mr. Spencer among thinkers of his own class consists in this: that before Darwin had published his "Origin of Species," or there had been any general discussion of the doctrine of evolution in its modern meaning, Mr. Spencer saw the evidence for that doctrine, accepted it with an unreservedness which it has scarcely commanded even from its later apostles, and began the construction of a system of philosophy upon the basis of it. His work was thus very much larger and more important than Darwin's. Darwin undertook the comparatively small task of proving man's physical descent from prehuman ancestors. Spencer undertook the vastly greater task of tracing the process of evolution through the entire range of animal and human life; through ideas and customs, through political and ecclesiastical institutions and beliefs, through all human society. In other words, Mr. Spencer was the first man, and, with the exception of his disciple, Mr. Fiske, has so far been practically the only man, to attempt an evolutionary philosophy, instead of considering evolution as merely a department in biological science. This stupendous task he began some forty years

ago in a series of volumes, the last of which reached completion but a few months since. The perseverence with which he has held to this task, through years of physical infirmity, indicates a strength of moral purpose altogether too uncommon. The entire accomplishment is a monument to the heroic enterprise of a devoted man.

Mr. Spencer's personal attitude toward the Christian religion crops out in many incidental references throughout his books. The least that can be said of it is that for the Christian minister it is a decidedly uncomfortable one. I have often been disgusted, and felt like throwing down my book, at the sneers which mar his pages where he speaks of the Christian religion as it is embodied, taught, and practiced in the Christian world. I have often felt like writing him a letter and saying to him something like this: "Now look here; you expect to revolutionize the world by your philosophy. So far as you expect to revolutionize religion, you can expect to do so only by the coöperation of Christian ministers. Their enlistment in behalf of your philosophy is the most important assistance that you can have or hope for. Why, then, do you so unmercifully and so unintermittently kick them? Or is that your idea of the way to gain a respectful hearing and a dispassionate consideration? Is it a part of your philosophy that the best way to get a man to agree with you is to abuse him?"

I have never written this letter and so cannot say what reply Mr. Spencer would make to it. But whatever he might say, his attitude of personal disrespect toward Christian ministers and Christian institutions is not to be taken to mean too much. Such an attitude is easily accounted for. When Mr. Spencer began his work he met with the same ill treatment, the same suspicion, the same accusations of materialism and infidelity, that have been accorded to many great innovators; and this, of course, principally from Christian ministers. Now, however sweet a man may naturally be, it is not in human nature for him to stand more than a certain amount of misrepresentation and vilification without getting into what may be called a "frame of mind." If Mr. Spencer could have been judged more fairly and more generously, if he could have been given credit for what was true in his work and honorable in his effort, no doubt the majority of his flings at Christianity would never have seen the light. The most of them are probably as much chargeable to the Christian ministry as to Mr. Spencer.

When we come to Mr. Spencer's religious philosophy, the first thing to be noticed is his doctrine of God. Now Mr. Spencer, so far from being an atheist, resolutely and consistently maintains his belief in the infinite. He goes so far as to declare that we know the existence of the infinite with a great deal more certainty than

we know the existence of the finite, which is about as far as the most of us could go. But for him the infinite — or God — is the unknowable. This unknowable is the power, or force, or reality, or whatever one may choose to call it, behind all phenomena. But what we know is the phenomena; the reality behind them we do not know, and cannot know.

About this doctrine, of course, there is nothing new. It is the reappearance, in a slightly different form, of Kant's old difficulty about "things in themselves." It rises from two misconceptions: the false distinction between things as they are in themselves and things as they are for a thinking subject, and an idea of the infinite which makes it exclusive of the finite instead of inclusive of it. If Mr. Spencer, at the beginning of his work, had set himself straight on these two conceptions, he would never have written so large a book about the unknowable. It seems as if he might have reflected that an infinite which is the mere negation of the finite, is nothing at all; or that an infinite which excludes the finite is not infinite, for the simple reason that it is not all-inclusive. If the finite — or anything finite — stands outside of the infinite—over against it—then by the existence of that something outside of it the so-called infinite is limited, and is itself finite. But if all things which we behold, ourselves with the rest, are included in the infinite,

then we know as much about the infinite at least as we know about things in general; so far from God's being unknowable, all knowledge is ultimately knowledge of God. And what sense is there anyway in talking about the existence of anything that is unknowable? If we mean absolutely unknowable, the only things that are unknowable are round squares, and triangles without three sides, and square roots of odd numbers, and things equal to the same thing but not to each other; that is to say, the only things that are really unknowable are the things that are unthinkable, and the only things that are unthinkable—I do not mean to you or me, but to any intelligence however inclusive—are the things that do not exist and which there is no sense in talking about. Moreover, if when we say unknowable we mean absolutely unknowable, we simply do not know that any such thing exists. For, whatever we know, we know by reason of some manifestation of it; but that manifestation is necessarily, so far as it goes, an indication of the nature of the thing of which it is a manifestation; therefore in order to know that a thing exists at all we must know in some degree what sort of a thing it is. The same thing that reveals its existence reveals necessarily in some degree at least its nature. If we cannot make any assertion about a given thing except that it exists, we cannot make even that. But Mr.

Spencer is very sure of the infinite. He says over and again that the infinite, and not the finite, is the thing that we are certain of. He must then either give up this assurance, or else acknowledge that this infinite of whose existence we are so sure is an infinite which is neither unknowable nor unknown.

Mr. Spencer, in apparent unconsciousness of what he is doing, accepts the latter alternative; he does not mean that God is absolutely unknowable. For he himself proceeds to make two very important assertions about God. He declares that God, or the infinite, is the source of all phenomena; he is the infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed; and this same power, he also affirms, which is thus manifested in phenomena, manifests itself in us under the form of consciousness. Now the characteristic of the unknowable is that you cannot make any assertions about it whatever, except that it is. According to Mr. Spencer himself then God is not absolutely unknowable, but only partially so. Very well, we do not any of us claim that anybody knows God, or can know him, entirely. Then the discussion between Mr. Spencer and any of us is not whether God can be known at all (which we both admit), nor whether he can be known altogether (which we neither of us claim), but only as to how far he can be known. This, which at first appeared like a fundamental

and irreconcilable difference, turns out therefore to be only a difference in degree and not in kind.

(It should be added parenthetically that this conception of God as the unknowable does not appear to be in any sense an essential part of the evolutionary philosophy.)

If now we inquire further into the significance of the two affirmations which Mr. Spencer makes about his infinite, we shall find this to be, from the religious point of view, something considerable. Mr. Spencer's first assertion is that from this infinite and eternal energy all things proceed. Turn this statement into religious language and what does it mean? It is the same as to say that the author of all things is God; without him is not anything made that is made; from his forethought and care nothing is absent; of his life all happenings are in some way a part; or, in other words, "in Him we live and move and have our being." That is good doctrine, certainly. Take now the other affirmation, that this same power which is manifested in the universe at large wells up within ourselves under the form of consciousness. What does that mean? Why, that is the same as to say that God who is manifested in nature is manifested more fully in humanity; that the mind which is in us is a part of the mind which is God; in other words, that God is (as we have always been taught) the father of our spirits; that the soul that dwells within us is no

stranger nor alien in the universe, that it did not come into being for the first time when it dawned in man, but it is only a coming-to-consciousness in man of that which has been forever self-conscious in God. And not only so, but I am persuaded that the reason Mr. Spencer refers to his infinite as an energy and not as a person is nothing more than the same superficial reason which led Matthew Arnold to deny that God was a person; a misunderstanding, namely, of the meaning of the word person as a philosophical term.

The second thing to be observed in Mr. Spencer's doctrine is his account of the origin of religion. Religion, he holds, originated in ancestor worship, which in turn grew out of the phenomena of dreams. The savage lies down to sleep. He dreams. In his dream he stands, like Pharaoh, upon the bank of a river; or he rides upon his horses; he chases the deer and the buffalo; he visits the tent of his relatives. He wakes to find his body where it was when he lay down. His friends tell him that he has not been absent from his hut. But he remembers very distinctly all these things which he performed in his dream. Who was it, then, that visited his relative, that stood upon the bank of the river, that rode upon the horses, while his body lay here upon the ground? Again he sleeps; and this time in his sleep others visit him; the wife

of his bosom stands by his bedside; the warrior whom he has longed to meet in battle bends over him to take his scalp. He awakes; there is no sign that these persons have been present in body; others who have been awake in the same room while he has been asleep have seen no such visitors. Now what conception arises from all these experiences? The conception, says Mr. Spencer, that man has another ego, a something inside him which we call his spirit, which is independent of his body, which wanders about, makes visits upon friends, fights battles with enemies, joins in the chase and the war dance, while this outward ego is asleep on the floor.

It is but a step from this to the belief that the spirits of men, being thus independent of their bodies, live after their bodies have perished. And this belief is further assisted by experiences of the same kind. The savage lies down to sleep, and in his sleep he is visited by the ghost of his departed father, who stands by his bedside and gives him instructions about the hunting-grounds or the government of his tribe. As he has paid reverence to his father while alive, so now he pays worship to the ghost of his father dead. He builds a rude altar which the ghost of his father may use as a dwelling-place, that he may not be obliged to wander about forlorn in the uninteresting world of spirits. To this altar the worshiper brings meat and drink for his father's

ghost. Here he pours wine upon the ground, so that the ghost of his father, when thirsty, may come and drink. Here he burns meat upon the altar, that the smell may arise and satisfy the ethereal hunger of his father's ghost. Thus begin the first rude rites of sacrifice and worship. Around the father's grave, or the altar erected as the home of his departed spirit, the brothers and sisters meet. Here family quarrels are made up, differences are adjusted, and worship becomes a social instead of a personal function.

In many tribes religion never passes beyond the form of ancestor worship; and in China today we find ancestor worship coupled with other forms of religion. But in prosperous tribes some great king will sometime appear, who unites the whole tribe into one great family. When this king dies, the members of the whole tribe unite in building a house for his spirit, and in offering sacrifices to it. Thus the idea of a deity becomes enlarged. Each family no longer has its own protecting spirit, or at least no longer its own alone; the whole tribe now has one in common. When the tribe goes into battle it goes in with the name of its great king upon its lips; his spirit rides at the head of the army. If the tribe comes out of battle victorious, it gathers again about the altar; additional rites and ceremonies are employed to express the common thanks to the protecting spirit. The conquered tribes conclude

that the spirit whom they worshiped when they went into battle is not so great as that which the victors worshiped, since he evidently could not deliver his children. So they are prepared to abandon him and worship the great spirit of the victorious tribe. Thus religion grows until we come to the reflecting stages of human life.

What shall we say of Mr. Spencer's account of the origin of religion and its bearing upon the Christian faith? I am going to say that it makes no sort of difference to the Christian faith whether this is the true theory of the origin of religion or not. Whether it is the true theory or not, nobody, for that matter, will ever know. But whether it is or not makes no difference to the Christian religion. Granting that it is, every process of evolution must be judged by its outcome and not by its beginning. If the idea of God and the belief in immortality began in this way, that in no degree invalidates the ideas of God and immortality which we hold to-day. As man is what he is irrespective of where he came from, so our belief in God and in a spiritual world rests now upon the logical and necessary foundations upon which it now stands, no matter what it once rested upon.

In addition to these doctrines developed by Mr. Spencer himself, his philosophy contains implications of quite different and superior importance. These implications are drawn out in the

various works of Mr. Spencer's great American disciple, Mr. John Fiske. Their bearing is upon the fundamentals of religion—upon those foundations upon which *all* religion rests, rather than upon the Christian religion exclusively. Nevertheless, whatever affects the foundations affects the superstructure; so, then, I will call your attention to one or two of these implications.

The first is this: Mr. Spencer, in what seems to his disciples a stroke of genius, defines life as an adjustment of inner relations to outer relations. A tree is alive because it can adjust itself to conditions of earth and atmosphere. A dog is more alive because in addition to these he can adjust himself to conditions of motion and place. If you kick him he will resent it, or at any rate he will move—toward you or from you; that is, his inner relations are capable of becoming adjusted to a new outer relation. Each advance in life, from plant to animal, from animal to man, from primitive man to modern man, is marked by the greater complexity of the outer relation to which the inner life can adjust itself. So far, very good and plain. Now, says Mr. Fiske, in his "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy," religion is an adjustment of man to his environment—the last and highest adjustment that man has made to that which is highest in his environment, namely, to his fellows as moral and spiritual beings, and *God*—in other words, to the *spiritual*

world. Now, continues he in his little book, "Through Nature to God," every advance that has been made through all the past in the adjustment of inner life to environment has been an adjustment to something in the environment that was really there. For instance, when the eye developed, and the fish, instead of merely feeling around, began to swim by sight, he thus adjusted himself to a new environment, or to a new element in his environment. But this adjustment was not to things that he imagined in his environment, but to things that were actual in it. This has been true of every advance in life, every new adjustment. But now to suppose that God, to whom man had at last adjusted his relations, and the adjustment of his relations to whom constitutes religion, is not really there, but is only imagined; or that he is not really what man thinks him to be; or in other words, to suppose that the spiritual life which has been developed in man by his adjustment to the environment of the spiritual world has been developed by adjustment to purely imaginary objects—this requires us to believe that in this one instance of additional adjustment the whole preceding history of man and nature is reversed; a belief which to the scientific and philosophical mind is impossible. This is the argument for the existence of God of which Washington Gladden recently said that it came the nearest to a demonstration of all that he had

ever seen. It is also the argument of which Mr. Fiske says, "This argument, so far as I know, is here presented for the first time." So then, if Mr. Fiske is right about this, and if his argument is good for anything, the doctrine of Mr. Spencer has done one service for religion.

The second religious implication of the Spencerian philosophy to which I said I would call your attention is as follows: According to Mr. Spencer religion has come into the world by the same process of evolution which rules throughout the universe. Not only so, but it is the last and highest manifestation of the working of this process of evolution. Now it is an accepted principle that from nothing nothing comes; that you cannot get out of anything anything more than there is in it; and that whatever has come out of the process of evolution in its later stages must have been present in some sense and in some manner from the first. Therefore, not only is religion a thing which the whole process of evolution, with its inconceivably vast periods of time and its equally inconceivably vast reaches through space, has been laboring to produce; but it is also something which in some way is inseparably connected with the sum total of existence, and has been in essence present at every stage of development. In other words, it is no manufactured article; nor is it an afterthought of God. It is a principle embodied in the inmost meaning of

the universe, and like all other principles so embodied working itself into human life when the proper time came. Religion, in other words, is one of the final products of human evolution; but human evolution is but a part of that vastly greater process of evolution by which the world was made, the suns and planets took their places, and all things which do now appear came to be where and what they are. Therefore, religion is that goal toward which, from out all past time and in all place, "the whole creation moves." Evolution in a world is the method of the universal life; religion is the final product of evolution; religion therefore is implicit in every step of evolution; realized in human life in the process of time it is in its essence eternal—enthroned at the heart of the universe itself.

Students of the ecclesiastical doctrine of the trinity (not the popular doctrine, which is a curious misunderstanding of the meaning of a great truth) will recognize that we have here, in Mr. Fiske's scientific reasoning, the same truth which is aimed at in the great doctrine of the trinity; the truth namely, that the relation between God and someone upon whom his love can be exercised and who can return it to him (and that constitutes religion, of course,) is not a temporary relation, coming into existence for the first time when the religious history of man began, but is inherent, and necessary, and eternal, in

the nature of God. So then Mr. Spencer, if he only understood himself as well as some of the rest of us understand him, would be a good trinitarian.

There is one other element in Christian faith to the bearing of which upon the Spencerian philosophy I must call your attention. That is the belief in revelation. It need hardly be said that the belief in revelation is fundamental to religion. If God is what Epicurus said he was—if he takes no interest in men—if God has not spoken, how can there be any religion? There is one sort of revelation in which Mr. Spencer, or any strict adherent of the evolutionary school, will find it difficult or impossible to believe. That is what may be called the hypodermic sort. If revelation must be the injection of particular pieces of truth into the mind of man from somewhere without, by miraculous processes which can neither be pictured by the imagination nor analyzed and understood by the reason, then upon the evolutionary view of the world there is no revelation. Most of the evolutionary writers, including notably Spencer himself, not being furnished by the religious thinkers of their time with any other conception of revelation, nor aware that there could be any other, have frankly rejected the idea of revelation altogether. I remember to have read a letter of Darwin in which he confessed to someone who had asked

his opinion, that, sorry as he was to say it, he did not think there had ever been a revelation.

But there is a conception of God, fast taking hold upon the modern world, which renders all such melancholy conclusions unnecessary; which in fact makes the doctrine of evolution a tremendous contributor, instead of a stumbling-block, to a belief in revelation. What idea of God was it that made Spencer and Darwin feel that they must draw from their evolutionary views such conclusions about revelation? It was the idea that if God existed at all he must be somewhere outside the universe, and if he revealed himself at all he must reveal himself by breaking into the universe at some point in time and place. But the more they looked for the time and the place in which he had thus broken into the universe from outside, the less they could find them. But what do we say of God to-day? That he stands not outside but within his universe. He is not the infinite carpenter and joiner, who at some particular moment in time puts together his worlds and makes the things that shall inhabit them; he is the infinite spirit unfolding within and through the universe. We have then but to join this idea of the immanence of God with the evolutionary view of the world, and we have the sublimest and the solidest conception of revelation that could be. Revelation becomes not a series of strange incidents in which God has

mysteriously injected certain truths into the human mind; but the whole vast process of evolution by which God has been unfolding his own life and exhibiting his own purposes and incarnating his own spirit, before the eyes and within the souls of men. Revelation is not some incident or episode, however important, in the evolutionary process, nor any series of such incidents or episodes, however imposing; but the whole evolutionary process itself is the revelation of God. Inspiration is not the action upon man of a force which dwells outside him, as the match upon the gunpowder or the torch upon the haystack; it is the coming to consciousness of the spirit of God within man. To this grand, continuous process, or revelation, nothing, in any time, in any place, is foreign; all things speak of God. To this idea of revelation the doctrine of evolution drives us, and that which at first seemed to imperil the belief in revelation, makes possible and imperative a far vaster and more noble conception of revelation. If, in the contemplation of the areas which it thus opens to our view, some of our own ideas seem to dwindle and some of our pet notions about God's ways to fade, it is only that God may be larger to us, more present in every part of his world, more active in behalf of all his children; more universally the author of all being, the source and revealer of all truth, and the father of all spirits.

The Problem of Biblical Interpretation

VI

ADVANTAGES OF THE HISTORICAL METHOD IN STUDYING THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY

REV. A. T. SALLEY, D. D.,

Pastor of the Main Street Free Baptist Church;

Instructor in Church History, Cobb Divinity School,

LEWISTON, MAINE

Advantages of the Historical Method in Studying the Old Testament

---

THE HISTORICAL METHOD IN BIBLICAL STUDY

The Bible is the great repository of religious truth, at least to the Christian Church. The oracles of God are in it. The foundation principles of moral and religious life are there. But it is a book. All its contents are in written form. It has all the varied characteristics of literature. The great question is how to interpret it, how to unfold that content. We have a shell of words and a kernel of truth; now, how shall we pierce this shell and secure the kernel? What are our tools? Simply the methods of interpretation which we adopt. With these we translate the words of Scripture back into the ideas which each writer sought to express. In the past, and in some quarters even now, the opinion has prevailed that the Scriptures are a form of writing so unique that ordinary methods of literary criticism and interpretation are not applicable to them. Hence the mysticism of Origen and his school. Hence the many false principles of interpretation which from time to time have been laid down.

Many others, while they do not adopt so radical a view as the above, cannot seem to free themselves from the impression that the Bible is a peculiar book and cannot be studied as other books are studied. This is certainly an error, a form of superstition, which puts the man who approaches the Scriptures for purposes of investigation in a wrong mental attitude. He is hampered at the start.

The true view is doubtless this: The Bible is a body of literature, subject to all the laws of written language, to be studied and understood in harmony with these laws. A letter of Paul or of James is a literary phenomenon of the same kind as a letter of George Washington or Abraham Lincoln. We must get at the meaning of each in precisely the same way. The method which will give us the thought of one will give us the thought of the other. A religious truth is expressed in the same way as a scientific or historic truth. There is nothing peculiar about its literary form.

Two methods, always inseparable, are made use of in unfolding the meaning of any piece of literature, viz., the exegetical, which lies at the base of all interpretation and consists of the explanation of language according to its laws, and the historical method, which explains a book or piece of literature in the light of the historical circumstances in the midst of which it was pro-

duced and which colored its thought, determined its form, and made it what it is, poetry or prose, history or prophecy.

It is not too much to say that the historical method includes the exegetical with an emphasis upon the historical situation. There are few passages in the Bible to which we could not apply this method if we had the data. As things are, only a little of the Bible can be clearly understood without an application of its principles; for each book, and each part of a book, was called out by some special circumstances and had its first application to men of the author's own day. Even such passages as the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah and Psalm 110, where the sweep into the future is so wide, including whole millenniums, were primarily for the author's contemporaries.

The purest Gospel, that which contains the great fundamental principles of all moral life with the least local coloring, are the sayings of Jesus Christ; but these were largely occasioned by definite conditions and circumstances in the daily life of Jesus or that of his nation, and were first spoken to the people who stood before him. We know of no addresses by our Lord which did not have a first application to some person or thing in Christ's own day. We may be helped in our thinking by putting the case before us in this manner: Jesus Christ sat on the slopes of

Hattin in the presence of a great multitude. As soon as they were quiet, he began to address them, and uttered the wonderful Sermon on the Mount. Before him were peasants and townspeople, ignorant and learned, most of them simple people, who knew nothing whatever of rules of interpretation, excepting those which all men instinctively use.

Can we for a moment suppose that he spoke so that none but those versed in certain special rules of hermeneutics could understand him? He expected his hearers to apply to his language the same rules which they were accustomed to apply to home conversation, street talk, or synagogue addresses.

When he talked to the Samaritan woman, he used language which could be easily and readily understood in any Samaritan home. But when he spoke to the crowds of Hattin and to the woman of Samaria, he spoke to us of this distant age, and certainly we must understand his words as they understood them; these sayings have suffered no mysterious change in transmission.

We might cite the epistles, for they illustrate the two facts that they, like all other sacred writings, have a background of history and are the product of a literary style only to be understood by a careful study of the epoch out of which they sprang.

Old and New Testament alike present the same phenomena, and it would be time wasted to interpret them, were it not that a lingering superstition exists that the language of the Bible is in some way different from ordinary language, and therefore ordinary methods of study are not applicable to it.

THE VALUE OF THE HISTORICAL METHOD IN THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

This value must be learned by an application of the method to particular passages of the Old Testament. The method is of use in understanding and explaining both entire books and single passages, poems, and individual phrases or words.

THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

Of the books of the Old Testament Jeremiah will serve as an illustration of the "historical method." The book of Jeremiah is a web of narratives, historical allusions, addresses, and letters, so inwrought and interwoven that an understanding of the prophetical part depends on a knowledge of the historical situation, and the historical situation is extremely intricate. Here are a few of the things that must be known before the book will yield all its secrets. Jeremiah begins his ministry in the thirteenth year of Josiah, king of Judah, and prophesied through the eighteen remaining years of Josiah, and the reigns of Jehoahaz, three months; Jehoiakim, eleven

years; Jehoakin, three months; and Zedekiah, eleven years. Judah was tributary to Assyria. Two years after the death of Josiah, Nineveh fell, and Assyria passed away, and Babylonia — known, also, as the Chaldean empire — took its place. For a few years Palestine was in the power of Egypt. Then it passed under the sovereignty of Babylon, remaining subject and tributary until the final overthrow of the Jewish state, 587 B. C.

During all this time Jeremiah was the prophet of God and counselor of the Jewish kings. He was intimately connected with the whole course of Judah's history during these years. A few references will show how close was his relation to secular as well as religious affairs. Allusion is made to Josiah and to the backslidings of Israel in his day (Jer. 3: 6); to the "evil from the north, and a great destruction" which is imminent (4: 6); to "the sound of the trumpet and the alarm of war" (4: 19); to the devastation of the whole land of Judah (4: 20); to the tragic death of Josiah (22: 10); and to the captivity of Jehoahaz, which was to be lifelong (22: 11, 12); to Babylon and the transportation thither of the Jews (20: 1–6); to Nebuchadnezzar (24: 1), the Chaldeans (24: 5), and to more than eighteen contemporary peoples (25: 19–26); to the Rechabites (35: 2–19), and to the residence of the Jews in Egypt (chap. 44).

To take away the historical element is to take away almost the whole book, and to obscure the historical situation is to mystify almost every line of Jeremiah's writings. Even those portions which seem to be pure prophesying were drawn out by certain moral conditions which then characterized the nation and which can be discovered only by careful investigation.

Perhaps we can best see how much is involved in making a rigid application of our principle to this book by stating the requirements in outline. We must know, (1) the moral and political conditions of Israel at this time; (2) the relation of Assyria to Judah; (3) the relation of Assyria to Babylon; (4) the relation of Babylon to Judah; (5) Judah's relation to Egypt; (6) the condition of Jewish captives in Babylon; (7) Jeremiah's relation to the successive kings of Judah; (8) Ezekiel's work in Babylon; (9) parts of the books of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles, the Prophecy of Ezekiel, and perhaps, also, some of the Psalms. All these are the side-lights which pour a bright illumination over every word and sentence, purpose and act of the book, and without which it cannot be understood.

PSALM 137

Of course what is true of whole books is true of shorter compositions like the Psalms. Psalm 137 may serve as an illustration of the shorter yet entire compositions. This Psalm falls into

two parts as far as our purpose is concerned, verses 1–6 and 7–9. Both sections are utterly meaningless apart from the historical situation. In the light which the author's condition throws upon it, the whole is luminous with beauty and sentiment. The writer is one of the many Jewish captives in a foreign land. His home is behind him, his friends are scattered, and his nation is destroyed; but more deeply loved and missed than any is Jerusalem, the holy city, David's city and the dwelling-place of God. The sound of her temple choirs no longer reaches his ears and thrills his soul. His vision is not gladdened by the sight of her priests and altar fires, nor his senses regaled with the odor of holy incense. But more than all, unholy feet tread her holy soil and defile her sacred places. Men of strange tongue and alien manners fill the courts of her temple, live in the homes once occupied by the governors, priests, and prophets of God's chosen nation and rule in the places of her power. They pass by the graves of her mighty honored dead with no thought of their great history. They curse and heap derision upon the holy name of the covenant God. Overwhelmed with sorrow and shame, our author sits down on the bank of a foreign river to weep, but his thoughtless captors intrude upon his grief and mockingly say, "Sing us one of the songs of Zion." Shocked at the heartless request, with true

Jewish pride he cries out, "How can we sing Jehovah's song in a strange land?" and then utters an awful imprecation that, if he should so far forget the honor due to Jehovah as to sing one of his temple songs for the amusement of profane ears, God would paralyze both hands and tongue. They are words of sacred praise, they shall not be sung to the sport of a pagan and ribald crowd.

The second part marks a sudden turn in the thoughts and feelings of the writer, and requires separate treatment. Cruel and godless as were the authors of his country's ruin, there is a people at the very thought of whom all the natural prejudice and inherited hate of his Jewish nature are kindled into intensest action. Did not Edom, their old enemy, he who should have been a brother and have helped them when the North poured out its flood of soldiery upon their land, stand on the heights which overlook the holy city, mingle freely and friendly with the hostile soldiers, encourage the besiegers, and say in their councils of war, when the enemy were discussing the fate of the city so soon to be theirs, "Raze it! Raze it! even to the foundations thereof!" What Jew could think of that awful day without having all the resentment of his nature kindled into a roaring flame? The guilt of Edom swells out into proportions that reach up to the very throne of that God whose wrath and condemna-

tion our author so bitterly invokes. "Remember, O Jehovah, against Edom, the day of Jerusalem." Then his thought comes back to Babylon, the author of his country's ruin, and he searches his native tongue for words strong enough to frame his imprecations against her and to paint his frightful pictures of an avenging judgment.

How can a man of God conceive or utter such inhuman sentiments? Men used to resort to all sorts of theological arguments to justify them, and in so doing they conjured up a theology more hideous than the sentiments to be explained. But here our historical method helps us. We are to judge this outburst of hatred by the spirit and teachings of the age. Men speak and act according to the moral standards of their times. We expect that. We interpret their sayings by that principle. A few facts must be kept in mind: (1) That the law of brotherhood as a world-wide principle was unknown in our author's day; (2) that heathen nations were not, in the eyes of the Jews, children of God and had no claim to kindly or merciful treatment; (3) that to cheat, enslave, or kill heathen people was rather meritorious than otherwise.

We shall be helped by going back into that general period in which our Psalm was written, discovering how other Jews felt toward foreign nations. The following is not exceptional:

"Do not I hate them that hate thee? [and all heathen were supposed to hate God] I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them my enemies." Ps. 139: 21, 22.

We could hardly speak of the heathen that way to-day. Here is a sentiment from the book of Deuteronomy (14: 21): "Ye shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself: thou mayest give it unto the stranger that is within thy gates, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it unto a foreigner." Judged by our standards, this would be rather unbrotherly treatment, but it would be totally unjust to carry back our 20th century standards by which to judge the men of those early days!

Here again from Deuteronomy (23: 3, 6): "An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the assembly of the Lord; even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of the Lord forever. . . . Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days forever."

Here is still another: "When thou drawest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it, and if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it, and when Jehovah thy Lord delivereth it into thy hand, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword, but the women and the little ones and the cattle and

all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, thou shalt take to thyself [the women and the little ones for slaves]; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which the Lord thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations. But of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth. But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee." (Deut. 20: 10, 12–17.) Yet to save such peoples as these, men and women all over Christendom are now asked by God to lay down their lives.

Second Sam. 12: 31 also furnishes us a passage pertinent to our purpose: "And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick kiln: and thus did he do unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. So David and all the people returned unto Jerusalem."

What are we to say of all these expressions of unbrotherly regard in the days of long ago? Simply this: the Jews were taught to believe, and in turn taught their children, that their heathen neighbors were under the curse of God,

a reprobate brood whom it was their right to cheat, enslave, or destroy as they might wish, and whom God would soon destroy. Only now and then a prophet was lifted to a higher plane, and from that height prophesied of a universal brotherhood and of a universal kingdom. Out of these narrow views our author spoke. He was but an exponent of his times, voicing a theology which Jesus Christ banished from off the face of the earth; but he spoke as well as he knew, and is not to be condemned or even criticised.

We are not at all capable of judging either the acts or words of a man until we have become familiar with his environment, the moral standards of his age, the social customs, the political institutions, the literature and literary models, and all else which can influence his conduct or shape his words: and these things are to be discovered only by the aid of the historical method.

SINGLE WORDS AND PHRASES

But our method is as applicable to single words and phrases as to songs, psalms, or books. A few illustrations must suffice. Our first shall be from Ps. 1:4: "like the chaff which the wind driveth away." This phrase seems perfectly simple and in need of no illumination. And yet our method gives a new vividness to an expression even so transparent as this. A simple custom of the times does this helpful work for us.

It was the habit of the people to prepare their threshing floors upon heights of ground exposed to the full force of the wind, so that when winnowing day came, and the farmer took his shovel ("his fan") and tossed the threshed grain high in the air, the wind would catch the light chaff and whirl it down the hillside—fit symbol of the destruction of the wicked!—while the heavy wheat would fall back onto the floor, cleansed and ready for garnering.

Another example may be found in Josh. 15: 15: "And he went up thence against the inhabitants of Debir: now the name of Debir before time was Kirjath-sepher." This verse seems to be perfectly clear as it stands. What simpler sentence or clearer statement is needed? But see, our method throws a new light upon the passage. Kirjath-sepher means "city of books," or a library city; while Debir, in the only place where it is not used of the name of a town, means "holy of holies," or sanctuary; that is, the holy part of a temple.

Now, modern investigations have discovered that the ancient temples were often the libraries of the ancient world. Prof. Hilprecht of the University of Pennsylvania has recently discovered a very ancient library in the old temple at Nippur. What far-reaching meaning that fact gives to this simple statement! When the children of Israel invaded Palestine they warred not

against a nation of savages, but against an enlightened people, a people with literature and libraries; and when Joshua attacked Debir he was invading a center of learning, a city which was at that time, or had been, the seat of literary activity. In the light of some such facts as these, we must revise all our old theories about Palestine and the condition of people at the time of the Israelitish invasion.

Innumerable other examples might be cited, but these are enough to vindicate this method of interpretation. It is not too much to hope that in the near future this instrument of investigation will be in the hands of every Bible student. Why should we be afraid of the light? In the light we see light. Investigation and historical criticism can alone put us in possession of those facts which are necessary to a full explanation of the Bible. If we could see the standards and know the customs and feel the prejudices and currents of thought belonging to any particular age, we would find its theology intelligible and ourselves in sympathy with the makers and holders of that system of thought, however false we may pronounce it. Every sentence, as, "I will take the cup of salvation," "I will lift up mine eyes to the mountains," "I have trodden the winepress alone," each image and picture, "like apples of gold in network of silver," "the bowl of the cup of staggering," and each doctrinal statement

owes its phrasing and much of its force and coloring to the author's environment. "He [God] breaketh me with a tempest, and multiplieth my wounds without cause." How dare mortal man thus blaspheme God? But one has only to go and look upon Job sitting in ashes and filth, diseased, forsaken, subjected to unjust suspicion and goaded on by stupid companions, to understand it all.

The trend in Bible study is toward a more critical investigation into the environment of the books. The mists are rolling away, the sun is shining clearer, we are understanding the Bible better. While invoking the Spirit's aid to the fullest, let us accept all other God-given aids.

VII

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT EVANGEL

BY

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY, A. M.

Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Criticism,
Cobb Divinity School.

The Historical Setting of the New Testament Evangel

Jesus Christ did not bring civilization into the world. While accelerating culture, he did not originate it. He joined with forces and tendencies already in existence.

CIVILIZATION BEFORE CHRIST

There were civilizations before our Christian era began. In China three thousand years before Christ, houses were built, fire was used, iron was discovered, and the plow invented; but the Christ came not to the teeming millions of China. Confucius, five centuries before his advent, was the acme of Chinese thought. But the Chinese could not then, nor since, serve the world. Devoid of imagination and indisposed to philosophy, with a monosyllabic and uninflected language which cannot express abstract or poetical ideas, they are constitutionally unable to speak to the universal heart of man, and never have influenced people outside of their own land.

Two thousand years before Christ there had settled in India a people manifesting many of the elements of modern civilization, whose religion and life have left in the Vedas a literature in

which scholars find not only beauty of thought and expression, but also knowledge concerning the origins of men and institutions. But Jesus is not described in the Vedas. He came not then. Nor did he come later in that Gautama who founded Buddhism. The religion of India, running into mysticism and asceticism and thence into emphatic individualism, where personal conduct became the sole basis of salvation, had no message for the world. There the gods are parts of nature, or celestial phenomena, more or less personified; and the thought of brotherhood is unknown.

That Egypt, whither, by strange providences unto his fathers, Moses had been led for instruction "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," was a land of mechanical skill, artistic culture, science, and literature more than a thousand years before the Christmas advent at Bethlehem, and yet the Christ came not to Egypt, populous, cultured as it was.

Babylon and Nineveh, from thirty to fifty centuries before Jesus came, were the capitols of mighty kings, with puissant armies and swarming populations, among whom religion and science were cultivated. The attainments of the early Babylonians, in mathematics and astronomy, as much as five thousand years before Christ, were far beyond those of the Egyptians. They divided the year into twelve months, and arrived

at the signs of the zodiac. The week they fixed at seven days by the course of the moon. They divided the day into twelve hours and the hour into sixty minutes. They invented weights and measures; they used the potter's wheel; they manufactured delicate fabrics, linen, muslin, and silk. The libraries of Nineveh, now coming to light, astonish the world. But Jesus came not to the banks of the Euphrates or the Tigris.

Phœnicia, the little strip of land lying northward of Palestine along the Mediterranean Sea, became the seat of a powerful people, at the culmination of their prosperity and influence under King Hiram, a contemporary of Solomon. The Phœnicians were noted for their glass, their purple dyes, their improved alphabet, and for their knowledge of the art of writing. In mining and in casting metals, in the manufacture of cloth, in architecture and in other arts they were not less proficient. But as a sea-faring people they are best known. Their ships scoured the Mediterranean, and pushed far out beyond the Straits of Gibraltar. They first gave trade and commerce to men, furnishing a means of transportation and communication. They, too, were the first colonizers. Other nations had absorbed peoples, drawing them in and settling them among themselves as subjects and captives. The Phœnicians sent out their people and made settlements in Cyprus and Crete, on the islands of the Ægean Sea, in

southern Spain and in northern Africa. On the latter coast, planted by Phœnicia, great Carthage sprang up, which later vied so strenuously with Rome for the mastery of the sea and the world. But, though the spirit of brotherhood and social extension began to be manifest amongst men, the Christ came not.

All the years of the Hebrew training preceded: the patriarchal age, the period of the prophets, the era of the judges, and the reign of kings, when under David and Solomon the nation attained its greatest unity, splendor, and strength. Then followed division, disruption, separation, weakness, captivity. The expectation of the Messiah was a hope unrealized; he came not.

Then a nation to the south and east arose—Persia. Under Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius, Babylon was conquered, the Jews liberated, Assyria absorbed, Egypt on the south and Macedonia on the north conquered. Darius ruled over at least eighty millions of people. His empire stretched from east to west for a distance of at least three thousand miles, and varied between five hundred and fifteen hundred miles in width. The Persians developed forms of government anticipating the later achievements of the Romans. Their empire was divided into satrapies, each ruled over by a satrap, with under-officials; taxes were levied and gathered; a system of coinage was introduced, vast military roads were constructed

and communication by land rendered possible, as the Phœnicians had made it possible by sea. But Jesus came not yet.

Greece flourished with all her glory and renown,—with her Homer and Xenophon; with her Marathon, Thermopylæ, and Salamis; with her Lycurgus, Solon, Pausanias, Themistocles, and Pericles; with her Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; with her Phidias and Praxiteles; but the Christ came not to Athens.

Philip of Macedon and Alexander stalked across the earth spreading the Greek language and Greek thought from the Adriatic on the west to the Indus on the east. All these wars and conquests were bringing more nearly together in one family the race of men to whom Egypt and Babylon had given culture, Phœnicia intercourse by sea, Persia political unity, and Palestine a monotheistic religion.

But in the West the greatest power of all was to arise. On the Tiber, nursed as at the dugs of a wolf, little by little grew the coming conqueror. Civil liberty was spoken of, citizenship became a new and vivid conception, the rights of the common people were at least in part recognized. Scipio, Pompey, Cæsar, Augustus, are names which conjure up this past. Rome prevailed over the then known world, east and west, north and south. Military officers, governors, tax collectors, philosophers, and pleasure seekers jour-

neyed over highways, costly and enduring, which bound the distant parts with the imperial city into one social fabric.

Now at length the Christ comes; but he comes not to Rome. He is not a part of the advancing tide of civilization, save as the moon is a part of the ebb and flow of the tide upon the seashore. In the Roman empire, under its domination, yet he is not of it. Rome's military arm at length drives the nails through his quivering flesh!

He comes at that time. He does not wait for the sympathy and support of a Constantine, nor for the zeal and enthusiasm of a Mahomet, nor for the great generalship and indomitable energy of a Charlemagne. He waited not for Columbus nor Napoleon; for Wickliffe, Huss, nor Savonarola; for neither Luther nor Calvin, neither the Puritans nor Roger Williams.

He was in no sense the flower of civilization. Nations did not make him. He came to a people distinctively slow and unprogressive, devoid of art, without inventive genius, not given at that time to trade or commerce, neither adventurers on the sea nor explorers on the land, nor yet possessing the genius of organization and government.

To understand his uniqueness and his marvelous influence in the world's history, one must study the history of other religions and other civilizations.

THE LAND TO WHICH HE CAME.

He did not enter upon life in a court or a palace. Born in an obscure corner of an obscure stable in the little south town of Bethlehem, he afterward passed his youth in an inconspicuous village among the hills of Galilee, and never went out of a territory smaller than a single county in the State of Maine. When we look for the Saviour of the world, we must pass by the great haunts of men, Athens, Rome, Constantinople, London, Paris, Berlin, Chicago. If Christ should come to Chicago, he would be unlike himself.

In one way too much stress has been laid upon the preparation of the world for his coming. It was not a preparation of fitness so much as of need. Far fitter times are now. But he was not made by his times. He was far greater than environment. His message was more than the mere phrasing of the underlying thoughts of men. He came in harmony with many of the unspoken needs of his day, but he was far above and beyond his day.

There was no holy land before his advent. The land shed no glory on him. He made the land holy. His people were a thousand years by their meridian. He drew no eminence from them. There was scarcely an unlikelier people—speaking from the point of view of worldly power and influence—to produce a world reformer than the Jews. But he came from them. Wealth, cul-

ture, aristocratic connections lent no lustre. He was the light of the world, because of what he was.

All Palestine, the scene of his activity, is but one hundred and forty-four miles in length, from Dan to Beersheba,—not a long distance between New England cities, even. He did not stride over the earth like a Colossus. At the south, its widest point, Palestine is ninety miles wide; at Jerusalem it is fifty-five miles wide; at the southern end of the Sea of Galilee it is forty miles, and at the far north it contracts to but twenty-five miles in width.

All Palestine is but one-fifth the size of the State of Maine. The single county of Aroostook contains eight hundred square miles more. It is two-thirds the size of New Hampshire; two-thirds the size of Vermont; three-fourths the size of Massachusetts; and just about equal to the combined areas of the States of Rhode Island and Connecticut. This small territory was the scene of Christ's activity. To us it seems like an out-of-the-way corner of the earth. It was not quite that in his day, and yet it was then far from being the centre of action and influence amongst men. It did not make him, he made it, famous.

THE OPPOSITION ENCOUNTERED.

His message was not heard without opposition. Not mere obscurity was to be overcome, but active and bitter hostility. We may name five

forces which Christianity had to meet and overthrow, political, intellectual, social, æsthetic, and religious.

There was the material force of the empire of the Cæsars, not quiescent and resisting solely by its own dead weight, but alarmed and enraged, and flinging itself with all its concentrated power upon the infant Church. Remember the persecutions, bloody and bitter, which followed in quick succession with the design of totally obliterating the message and the message-bearers. Christians were charged as having hatred for mankind (*odium generis humani*, as Tacitus alleges); Christians were maligned because their modes of worship were so unlike pagan modes; they were the subjects of all manner of slanders and calumnies; calamities, pestilences, droughts, wars, tempests, and diseases were laid upon the responsibility of the Christian religion, because it was averred that the gods were incensed at Christian worship; Rome even feared that her own sovereignty was plotted against; and then began the bloody work of repression or extermination. Laws were enacted against Christians; decrees issued; fires kindled; wild beasts fed; and the procession of witnesses—"martyrs"—dragged its mournful spectacle across the world's stage, at the command of Nero, Domitian, Marcus Antoninus, Severus, and other emperors. But the message was greater than political power.

There was the intellectual force of speculative philosophies, acute and persistent. Think of the early heresies in all the forms of gnostic speculation which began even while the Apostle Paul was penning his epistles to the churches, and were embodied in the persons against whom he utters warnings—Hymenæus, Alexander, Philetus, Hermogenes, Phygellus, Demas, and Diotrephes. Then how philosophical heresies multiplied under the leadership of such men as Simon Magus, Menander, Nicolas, Cerinthus, Valentinus, Basilides, Arius, Socinus. Through nineteen centuries sects and schisms have multiplied, down to a science which proclaims itself Christian, and travesties which profess to be apostolic.

There was the social force of customs associated with every circumstance of human life, and twining around all that is best and all that is worst in the human heart—its joys and sorrows, its licentiousness and its greatness. Manners and habits in the family resisted the admonitions of the message; but the message spoke on, prevailing gradually over parental tyranny, over female degradation, over loose marriage and looser divorce practices, over corrupt standards of personal purity, over cruel and barbarous methods of treating slaves and even over slavery itself. In business, in industry, in society, in the seclusion of the schools, in the games and sports of

the populace, the influence of Christianity swept on. It was greater, more potent than all its environment.

All æsthetic forces stood at first opposed to Christianity, and Christianity at first was opposed to them. But the Christian religion took art and made it her handmaid, though the subjugation was slow. Before the advent of Christ art had no lofty ideals. There was beauty of certain forms, sensuous, emotional, but not noble and grand. To architecture Christianity committed the construction of her temples; and then chiseled stone and groined arch arose, father and son working, one generation after another, upon the same cathedral, as though building for eternity. Naitam, king of the Picts, advised his people to become Christians, when he saw that the missionaries erected the best building in Britain for a church.

Christianity gave to music and song its most exalted themes and its noblest incentives. The organ, the chant, the chorus, the pæan, the dirge, the requiem, the oratorio, the cantata, throb and swell through majestic porches and vaulted roofs because of Christianity's adoption of music.

In sculpture, painting, and poetry, also, the message of Christ has given the subjects and furnished the motives for the world's masterpieces; but all these prevailed not easily, not by quick and ready reception. Into centuries of

pagan growth and development had been inwrought other ideals and other conceptions which Christianity must displace. The message was greater than that which any art of China, India, Egypt, or Greece could produce; it was a message of man and God, for eternity.

Then, too, there was the spiritual force such as is always wielded by ancient and established superstitions. Idolatry, polytheism, dualism, pantheism, materialism dominated tenaciously the minds of men. Demons peopled the air, causing sickness and distempers; fairies and gnomes, brownies and sprites, witches and hobgoblins dwelt in the dells and ransacked the earth and exploited the night; ghosts and spirits, dreams and omens, portents and signs held magic sway over men, regulating their daily affairs and disclosing the mysteries of the future. With all these the message was obliged to contend; but it was greater than they all. It came and prevailed.

THE ENVIRONMENT OF THOUGHT AND LITERATURE.

While potent forces opposed Christianity at the outset, yet there were also currents of thoughts and forms of expression and even philosophical and religious conceptions of which it could avail itself by adaptation and assimilation. The Greek language, the Greek literature, and even Greek philosophical systems made contributions to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Jesus spoke undoubtedly both the Aramaic dialect of his native land and also the Greek speech of men of trade and government in that land. His apostles, even more than he, were controlled, though unconsciously, by Greek modes of thought and phrasing. They wrote in Greek, transferring more or less closely into Greek idioms many conceptions, however Jewish, which they wished to express. Their very thinking was determined to no small degree by the mould into which their thought was cast. We must approach the apostles and their Master to-day through the medium of this classic tongue, not in its pure classic forms, and yet with the aroma of the classic vintage still lingering about it.

Jesus taught as a peripatetic philosopher, journeying in extreme simplicity from place to place, attended by a band of pupils, giving instruction by means of the question and answer, the anecdote and story, the parable, the explanation and the application. It is a Greek class room, not a Jewish, which is depicted on the pages of the New Testament.

Modern theology has been said to show a larger influence of the Nicene Creed than of the Sermon on the Mount, while yet more obviously has the Nicene Creed caught up into itself the prevailing spirit and forms and conceptions of Greek philosophy than of the Sermon on the Mount. Yet Jesus himself was not unaffected by the cul-

ture of the world which emanated from Athens. He adopted none of its dogmas and used none of its rhetoric, and yet the atmosphere of its thinking was his also; the universality of his view and the penetrative simplicity of his teaching were Grecian.

Yet far more distinctively was Jesus submerged in Jewish thought and feeling. Apart from the Old Testament and Talmudic doctrines and Rabbinic conceptions his utterances can scarcely be understood. His point of view was oriental, not occidental. Natural objects, social customs, popular notions, are all from the East.

The doctrines which he emphasized most often may be found in germ in the Old Testament—the Fatherhood of God, "the Son of man," sin, righteousness, salvation, and "the kingdom." Jesus came speaking to the Jews and seeking the lost sheep of the house of Israel. His terminology and the assumptions which he did not take occasion to develop, because already understood, issued from Jewish sources.

One cannot read the New Testament without constant reference to the Old, not because "a scarlet thread of blood" runs through the Old Testament, prefiguring the culminating sacrifice of the New, but because the history of the New Testament, the quotations of the New Testament, the allusions of the New Testament, the imagery of the New Testament, and the underlying

thoughts and conceptions of the New Testament are derived in their elements at least from the Old.

So likewise the literature of the Jews outside of the Old Testament, which is known as the "apocalyptic literature," has a definite relation to the contents of the New Testament, particularly in those parts which are predictive of the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the world, the last judgment, and the coming of the Son of man.

Jesus entered into historic relations with his day. For an appreciation of him, an understanding of his times and his environment is necessary. From such an investigation both the amount of assimilation from that environment and of positive difference with that environment in the person and work of Jesus become apparent. If Jesus be more than his day, then to discover how much more he was, one must know well that day. Both his adaptation and his individuality are involved.

PERSONALITIES EMPLOYED

Jesus was the central personality. It was not his words, not his works, not his magnetic influence that so profoundly moved men, but it was he himself. Christianity was more than instruction, or doctrine, or catechism, more than a system of truth, philosophical or theological, for Christianity preëminently was, and is, Christ.

The message is in his person. The evangel is received not so much by syllogism and statement as by contact and contagion. Jesus was pattern and example more than teacher or preacher. He was himself exemplification of the truth he brought rather than exemplifier of truth. To know Jesus was to have life everlasting; to do his will was to know his teaching. Discipleship consisted in imitation of his life, rather than in the repetition of his words. He was the revelation; he was the incarnation of God; he was himself the embodiment of the good news brought to men. The leaven, hidden in the measure of meal, needed simply the power and efficacy of its own nature.

About this central person were gathered at first twelve other persons; and then the contagion spread. It was not by the dissemination of literature, nor by the promulgation of a doctrine, nor by the giving of a password; it was solely by the spread of the life. This means by the modification and enlargement of personality in the disciples.

We do not know the external, physical characteristics of Jesus,—his height, weight, complexion, eyes, hair. Personality, however, does not consist in externals. Beauty, stature, form, complexion have their values, but the plainest people sometimes are the most forceful and influential. We cannot see the face of Jesus. All

traditions are untrustworthy. The legend of St. Veronica is wholly mythical. We can see Christ, however, in four distinct types, to use a classification employed by Professor Sanday in the new Dictionary of the Bible:

(1) We can see the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels; this is a biographical type, a man of action, of compassion, of gentleness, of purity, of dignity, of love; (2) we may see the Christ of the apostles, a Christ exalted, adored, addressed as Lord, recognized as in position and glory beside the Father, the Christ more of philosophy and explanation; (3) we may see him as the Christ of the undivided Church, now the Christ who fits into a scheme of salvation, a doctrinal personage with a doctrinal relation to a system of truth, whose nature and office, revelatory of the Father, work for man an atonement with the Father and a redemption from sin; this is the Christ of Theology; (4) we may see him also in experience,—he then is friend, present helper, inspiration, strength, and solace.

But in whatever form he be seen, he is central and supreme. From him issue the radiance and glory, the power and efficacy, of the New Testament evangel. To know Christianity one must know Christ. There are no substitutes; there are no short cuts. Christ is Christianity. There is no other religion of personalities. Buddhism is not Gautama; Mohammedanism is not Ma-

homet; Parseeism is not Zoroaster; but Christianity is Christ, and Christ is Christianity.

To personalities Jesus left his religion. The only formula, even, which he taught his disciples was a prayer, "Our Father, who art in heaven." This is not a confession of faith nor a declaration of principles, though faith and principles may be involved in it. It is rather an act of homage, of devotion, of worship. It does not seem, either, that this was designed to be a liturgical form of prayer. The disciples in the early church prayed in other phrases and forms.

Jesus left nothing else in fixed form or phrase. His religion went out and on from him by contact and contagion. His personality, so far as possible, became transferred into other personalities. Life was the great personal dynamic in the days of Jesus, as it is now. He trusted his message primarily to life and not to statement. He even so left it that our knowledge of him should depend almost wholly upon the personality of the men with whom he associated. We look at John and we see Jesus as John saw him. John's personality is the mirror in which the personality of Jesus is reflected. Is the mirror faithful? Does it give back the image correctly? Are there blemishes in the glass? Do we see indeed darkly? The apostles are our intermediaries. What kind of men are they? We can name them, but what are their characteristics?

The apostles were at best humble men,—peasants, fishermen, Galileans, Jews. A powerful personality had affected them. Yet they were not reduced to a dead level, or raised to the same high plane. They preserve their own personalities, their individualities, their peculiarities. Inspiration has not flattened all the contours of personality,—rather it has increased the elevations and exalted the mountain ranges and peaks. Paul is not like John. Luke writes differently from Mark. Matthew and Peter have marked distinctions. Each writer, differing from all others, presents a different aspect of the Christ, shows a distinct facet of the one central personality.

Not that these differences are broad and striking. Many Christians, who have read their Bibles for years, do not know that differences exist within the compass of the New Testament books, differences in conception and differences in the delineation of the one common Lord, the Christ. But the differences are there, and careful scholarship has long taken note of them. Based upon this recognition of characteristic differences in the point of view and in the doctrinal conclusions of the writers of the New Testament, an entirely separate department of theological learning has become known in recent years, the department of Biblical Theology.

Systematic theology takes its point of view with God, with external, outside truth, to see the parts and the whole in mutual relations. Dogmatic Theology takes its point of view with the Church, to vindicate and justify what she believes and proclaims; while Biblical Theology takes its stand by the Bible, not to cite and quote specific texts, not with any assumption that the Bible is the only source of information and the only court of appeal, but to discover exactly what the Bible is as a whole, and what it teaches in its various parts, book by book.

Biblical Theology recognizes the fact that within the compass of the New Testament itself there are distinct types of doctrine and teaching. There is a Pauline theology and a Johannine theology; Luke presents the person of Christ after one manner, Mark and Matthew each after another, while John distinct from them all; James differs from Paul; the Epistle to the Hebrews has its distinctive features.

Biblical Theology recognizes personalities; it acknowledges distinctions, individualities, peculiarities. It gives heed to times of composition, to chronological arrangements and relations, and to stages of development and growth. It is right. Jesus did not give a system of faith or ethics to men. He touched men; he imparted life; he aroused and quickened personalities. Soul culture was his object, not mere head and brain

culture. When a soul had begun to grow, he left it to develop, and by its impact on others to stimulate them to life and growth. His message was intrusted, not to documents or writings, not to statutes or decrees, not to rules or canons, not to forms and phrases, not to systems and institutions, but to men, to persons. For the propagation of his kingdom Jesus relied upon and employed personalities.

What supreme confidence the Almighty has always reposed in human nature! He made man and endowed him with the plenitude of free moral agency and personal responsibility. He intrusted his Son to incarnate form amongst men; he let men have power over that Son, even to the lengths of crucifixion.

What supreme confidence Jesus evinced in humanity! We safeguard our little ideas. When we organize an institution, we carefully phrase a constitution and by-laws, and strenuously hedge against amendments and changes. When we endow colleges and seminaries, we punctiliously prescribe that the income of our benefactions shall be used only for promulgating certain forms of teaching, and we insist that men shall subscribe periodically to a creed or statement which perpetuates us and our conclusions, as though we knew the whole truth for all time, and could not trust our fellow-men of this and future generations to think for themselves and administer what

is really out of our control, in changed conditions, better than we ourselves could plan. When we establish churches and ordain men to the ministry of Christ, we insist upon exact phrases and tenets, as if a man by some chance might differ from us and so go astray!

Jesus trusted men. When he was no longer present in the flesh, men became his representatives. The very name given them signified that they were patterns of Christ. They represented him, and in a very real sense Christians became the incarnation of Christianity. This was at a time when there was no New Testament of any kind, and they were making the books of the New Testament. Christ left his life in them. They were the personalities of the message then. They might but partially comprehend, they might for a season totally misunderstand and misrepresent; but he trusted them. Heresies, schisms, "holy"—oh, the mockery of the term!—"holy wars" might arise; but he trusted men. Pride and arrogance might elate pontiffs and prelates; lust of power and greed for gain might fill the minds of those appointed to minister unto the world; but yet he trusted men. All his kingdom was left to the care of men; all that he came to accomplish by his life and death was committed to the custody of men; all of his ministry of compassion and grace was assigned to men. What exaltation of personality was this! Was

ever greater honor conferred upon humanity? The Christ by his coming and by his treatment has glorified the personality of man.

Yet herein arise the problems of inspiration, for in the reception and extension of the message the human element persists; and the problems of that criticism which is called "higher," but more appropriately should be named historical, for the times and places and circumstances of the authors must be known before their utterances can be understood; and the problems of Biblical Theology, for the similarities and differences between different authors must be noted and weighed before their combined message can be interpreted and comprehended; and the problems of Palestinian geography and topography and of local Jewish thought and theology, for until the people and places of his earthly career are known no one can be assured that he did not owe his greatness to his times and his environment; and the problems of comparative religion and comparative civilizations, because only in a recognition of the universal religious needs of the race and a comparison of the searchings and conclusions of worshipers of all time can the superiority of the final and divine form be proven unto thinking men.

The New Testament evangel has been set in a framework made up of human elements, which need to be investigated and tested that the divine in its setting may be brought to light and clearly

seen. The problems may seem at times to be many, but the data at hand for their solution are abundant, and the recompense of the reward unto the searcher after truth is rich and assuring.

The Problem of Practical Work

VIII

THE MINISTER'S PERSONALITY AND METHODS

BY

REV. C. S. PATTON, A. M.,

Pastor of the University Congregational Church,
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

The Minister's Personality and Methods

What view one takes of the details of any calling will depend more or less strictly upon one's view of the calling as a whole. Minor differences of opinion usually grow out of some more fundamental difference. Speaking practically, perhaps superficially, there are two more or less clearly distinguished views of the ministry. One of these is that it is a calling far removed from any and all others in the world; that the motives which lead men into it should be as far as possible from the motives which lead men into other honorable callings; that the feelings which sustain one in its labors are unlike those which make men in other callings willing to undergo similar toils and hardships; and that, the ministry being thus totally unlike all other human pursuits, the minister should habitually maintain the separateness to which God has called him, and be as much unlike his fellows as he can. Such is the attitude of ministers who always dress as much like a separate order of beings as possible,—men of the long-tailed coat and the white necktie every day in the week and all the year around; men in whom the clergyman swallows up the

human being, and who lose themselves in their profession; who commune with God not so much because it is every man's privilege to do so, but because there are no persons upon the earth, especially among the laity, with whom it is profitable to commune.

The second view is the reverse of this. It is that the minister is first of all a man, and that as much of a man as he is, so much of a minister will he be, and no more. That the few things which mark him off from his brethren are incidental, compared with the things that link him to them. That he will succeed, not in so far as he holds himself aloof from men and fails to appreciate them, but in so far as he knows them and is one of them. That the motives which govern honorable men in honorable callings the world around are motives for the minister, and that, like his pattern, he is to keep himself in all things like unto his brethren, with the single exception which will hereafter appear. It is this view of the minister and his work which will determine the items for success that I shall set before you; for it is certainly this view that my own experience teaches me more and more to hold.

The first essential of success in the ministry is the right sort of life and character. The minister's business is to make men better, but except by mistake no man can make other folks any better than he is himself. More men fail in the minis-

try, twice over, because they are not quite good enough than for any and all other reasons. And yet here I do not mean that the minister should endeavor to establish a monopoly upon any peculiar kind of goodness, nor that ministerial goodness is different in kind from any other sort of goodness. I do not think that many men fail in the ministry because they are not unworldly enough, nor because they are not pious enough nor religious enough; I think they often fail because they are not honest enough, not kind enough, not unselfish enough. The goodness which men care for in a minister, and which will go far toward making his work a success, is not a goodness unlike that which they demand in other good men; it is our common human goodness, accentuated, increased, multiplied.

Of this, however, it is of little or no use to speak. A man's character is pretty well formed by the time he is old enough to enter the Christian ministry. If he is not the right kind of man, it is too late to make him over at that time in his career. You may patch him up a little,—sometimes you cannot even do that,—but if he has come to the entrance of the ministry and has not the personal habits and character that are the prerequisites for making men around him better, about all you can do is to get him sent to the legislature. If he has no charity, no ingrained unselfishness, no habitual preference for others

over himself; if he is opinionated, censorious, sour; above all, if he is not absolutely honest and straightforward, you cannot do anything with him in the ministry. If I do not speak more at length of this, it is not because it is not the most important of all items, for it is; it is because it is a matter not to be mended or made after one is already standing at the threshold of the Christian ministry.

I do not hold to a varying standard of ethics,—a sliding scale which puts the demands at one place for one profession, and the demands for men in other callings at other places. I hold to the absolute moral equality of the minister with all other good men. Whatever demand the law of God makes upon the minister it makes upon every man. And yet, we must consider the place in which we stand. The good or the evil that a man may do varies largely with the position he occupies. For a President of the United States to be a drunkard or a debauchee may be no worse for him individually than for any other man to be the same. But in its influence upon public morals it is worse than for a hundred unknown men to go wrong. The minister is in a sense a public man. He must expect that questionable conduct upon his part will be magnified by the public. Things which would be passed over in other men will be dragged to light in his career. For him to have even the appearance of

going wrong means the destruction of his usefulness, reproach upon his profession, and disgrace to his name. Therefore a part of the minister's profession is to avoid even the appearance of evil. Indiscretion is deplorable in other men; in the minister it is criminal. There are not many men in the ministry who are consciously bad. But so high is the standard which men demand of the ministry that the presence in it of men who are indiscreet, who are not wise and self-controlled, is a burden which loads it down sadly. It is not enough for a minister to be good; he must be known to be good. Those who would be glad to see his profession dishonored must have no opportunity to bring it into disgrace by reason of his carelessness. He should remember who he is.

After the right kind of character, the first essential for rational success in the Christian minister is a rational idea of what success is, and how it is to be measured. A man must accept his times for what they are. He cannot do in one age what he might have done in another. He should do what he can, and all he can, but he should not discourage himself by reaching after the impossible, nor should he reproach himself with failure because he has measured his results by false standards. I do not believe that the influence of the minister is waning or is destined to wane. Much less do I believe his function is

fulfilled by the religious periodical, the religious novel, or the daily press. But everybody knows, or ought to know, that for the last generation the character of religion has been gradually but surely changing. The type of theology preached is no longer calculated to produce the same immediate and startling results that have been secured in other days. If the old type of religious thought should be preached again, the same results could not again be produced by it; for it no longer finds the same sort of soil into which to sink.

A clergyman of this State recently said to me: "When I was a young man I had a continuous revival in my church. And as I look back upon myself as I was at that time, my present conviction is that I did not know enough to go in when it rained. But now, when I have really something to preach, and know how to preach it, I cannot do anything." That is, he meant he could not produce results that seemed commensurate with his effort, as compared with the results of his labors years ago. We may deplore this; but at least it is wise to accept it. "Expect great things from God, attempt great things for God," some man will quote to you. Yes; that is, rationally interpreted, expect from God what you have reason to believe God is likely to do, and attempt what you have reason to think can be done. The man whose ideal is not higher than his performance will soon deteri-

orate in both. But the minister who is discouraged because he cannot do the same sort of work by his preaching as he could have done by it forty years ago is foolish. The results of his work must be measured by a standard that fits the time in which he works. How figures do lie when you come to the work of the minister! Why do we allow ourselves to stand or fall according to the Year Book? Why do we bow down so before the mere matter of numbers?

I knew a young clergyman who upon graduation from the seminary took a church of two hundred members in one of our Western States. In three years he had increased the membership to five hundred. This phenomenal accomplishment was heralded in the papers, religious and otherwise, of his section of the country, and made him a great name. He was called to one of the larger churches in one of the larger and more important cities of the middle West, and last June he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. But he could not have remained in the church which he thus built up a year longer. Already his influence was waning. The man who has followed him has seen his congregations dwindle and pine in spite of all he could do. Not one single department of the church is to-day permanently stronger than it was ten years ago. Meanwhile the taste of the community has been debauched by nickel-plated oratory, and by cheap

dramatic entertainments on Sunday evening, called lectures. The Sunday school has grown large and noisy; the church rolls have been swollen with the names of men, women, and children who have no intelligent or lasting interest in the church, and in every possible respect the church was worth a good deal more before this phenomenal young man got hold of it.

On the other hand a church may remain stationary in numbers and make a steady gain in spiritual influence. I would not imply that the smaller one's tangible results the better he should be satisfied. Nor yet that the absence of visible results necessarily indicates a valuable work beneath the surface. But who is the successful minister? I have only one answer. He is the man who succeeds in making the little world in which he lives better and more Christian. The man who goes into the ministry to-day expecting to turn the world upside down will be disappointed. Or if he is not, those who watch him and those who follow him are apt to wish that he had left it right side up.

I name, in the third place, among elements of success in the ministry, an ability to appreciate the secondary motives for ministerial work. And by that somewhat enigmatical phrase I mean something as follows: Everyone knows what the main motive of life and work in the gospel ministry should be. A man should go into the

ministry because he feels a high and noble impulse toward it; because he feels that in no other place can he make his life count for so much for God and mankind. It ought to be an act of consecration or of noble self-sacrifice, as when the sailor plunges into the sea to rescue a drowning man. But a man cannot be in that state of mind all the time, can he? It was a saying of Edmund Burke that no nation founded solely upon the heroic virtues could stand. I suppose he meant because no nation could be forever in the heroic frame of mind; and it would be unreasonable to suppose that ministers can do what other folks cannot.

And what will the minister do when it does not appear as if he were accomplishing anything worthy of sacrifice? When the rainbow tints that surrounded his entrance into the ministry have vanished, and he finds himself laboring among details that are wearisome and distressing, for people who do not appreciate him, with the narrow, the intolerant, the unwilling; when instead of dwelling all the time, as some suppose ministers do, upon the heights of religious feeling, or in association with poets and philosophers, he has to spend it talking to the old ladies who grumble because he has not been around to see them for so long, or in trying to bring back to his fold some narrow-minded brother who is intent upon going where "he can get the Simon pure

gospel"; when he has to turn his back upon that which he feels would be for his own highest interest and the best interest of his people, and spend half his time doing what they have grown accustomed to demand of their ministers,—what will the minister fall back upon then? The glorious opportunities of the ministry? But they do not always look glorious. The high character of his calling? But it does not always look so high. Religious feeling? It is literally drummed out of him by the incessant round of petty duties, half of which he feels might just as well, or better, be left undone. Upon what, then? Why, upon this: the simple fact that every honest man must earn his living, and that that is his first and supreme duty in life. The minister does not cease to be a man; and there is no man living whose first duty to the world is not to earn an honest living. But he must earn it, not simply take it, and it must be an honest one,—a dollar's worth of good hard work done for every dollar paid him. And why should not the desire to earn an honest living help to keep a man faithful to the duties of the ministry as well as to those of any other calling?

"But that introduces the mercenary spirit into the ministry," some one will say. Not at all. No man should go into the ministry for money; and the Lord has mercifully provided against any such temptation by ordaining that any man of average

intelligence can earn more at almost anything else than he can at preaching. But when a man is once in the ministry, for the reasons that may properly put him there, there is nothing dishonorable, but quite the reverse, in his earning like a man the salary that is paid him.

One danger to ministerial faithfulness comes from the fact that the financial stimulus which helps average mankind to do its work is absent from the ministry. A good many ministers would do considerably more work in a given time if the money they received were more in direct proportion to the work they do. Many are the times I have felt like getting onto my horse, and going off into the country for a two hours' ride, when I have been called back and set to reading my books or making my calls, from the mere thought that if I did not do this I should not be earning my salary. And sometimes there is not much else to keep one going, — I mean for the time. One cannot be forever in the heroic frame of mind.

The thing that the minister ought to do will often at that particular moment not look to him at all like an indispensable thing; he cannot make it seem that the salvation of the world, or any portion of it, is nearly or remotely dependent upon it. But he can say to himself at least that he is paid for it and that therefore he ought to do it, and to do it heartily and well. You will say at

once that this is not the highest motive by which to keep a minister at work. I know it. I do not advertise it as such. But a thing may not be the most ethereal thing in the universe, and yet may be very useful and honorable in its own place. The beginning of a man's ministry is like the honeymoon; it's a very exalted state, but it cannot last always. But after it is gone, there may be more sober satisfactions, and more workable motives upon which he can fall back for the pursuit of an honorable and useful career.

The minister, as the world has known him so far, is not above needing the motives that appeal to ordinary men; he is in fact altogether too much removed from them. When the doctor neglects his patients his income falls off. If the lawyer will not work, neither does he eat. But the minister folds his hands and the ravens feed him. I would not advocate any other system of financial remuneration. So much a pastoral visit, so much a sermon written, would render the minister's work mercenary. But the fact that the community puts him upon his honor, pays him so much and leaves him to do his work how and when he will, should make him doubly and trebly scrupulous that he never gets a penny which he does not earn.

A fourth quality more or less essential to success in the ministry of to-day is a sense of proportion. I attended an informal conference of

some twenty Congregational ministers a few weeks ago, called to consider the state of the churches of our order in Maine. It appeared that in many localities the Congregational church has for some years made little or no gain. Some of the churches which have stood still or receded are in the country, others are in the cities. Many of them are manned by the young men whose vigor and enthusiasm would lead one to expect the very greatest results. During the discussion of the subject, one man, whose judgment all those present highly esteemed, declared, "I do not hesitate to say that many of the younger men in our denomination throughout this state are not the right men, and that the fault lies directly with them." Then he went on to say what he thought was wrong with these men; and what he said in substance was this: that a good many of these younger ministers had no sense of proportion in their preaching. They did not distinguish between things that may be preached once in a while, and the things that must be preached all the time. To my mind this is a grave criticism.

There never was a time when the sum total of human knowledge in every department was so legitimate material for the preacher as now. But not all things that the minister may utilize in his preaching are equally important. There are things that lie away off on the edges of the Chris-

tian life; there are other things that lie at the heart of it. I believe, for instance, in the methods of the higher criticism and in the doctrine of evolution. I not only believe in them, but I believe that to an extent generally unsuspected they have light to shed on the religious life of mankind. But they are not in themselves religion. And for the preacher to forget the great needs and capacities of the human soul while he preaches nothing but the doctrine of evolution, is to make of himself not a preacher at all, but a mere lecturer. To bury the unquestioned, world-old facts of the religious life beneath the results of the higher criticism, is to feed people on husks.

Do not misunderstand me on this point. I would go so far as to say that any young man who does not understand the methods of the higher criticism and the doctrine of evolution is unfitted to preach to an intelligent congregation in these days. I would not willingly ordain to the ministry a young man whose intellectual equipment dates wholly from a half century ago. But neither do I think a man prepared to do the work of a Christian minister who does not understand the fundamental facts of the spiritual life, and who cannot see that religion is something more than theology or science. A man must have a sense of proportion. He must know what things must be preached incidentally and what fundamentally.

Another quality that the minister needs above other men is patience. Most men work with things. And when things do not go to suit, they can be made to conform. But the minister deals with people. And not only do people fail to do what one wants them to oftener than things do, but when they do so fail one cannot resort to the simple method of pushing and pounding them around till they do. People are conservative. I remember hearing a man tell a story once about how, when he was a boy at school, he proposed to some other boys that they should make a raid on the schoolmaster, and rescue a fellow mortal whom the said schoolmaster was unlawfully detaining after school. The boys to whom the proposition was made gave their approval, and the designer of the plan of rescue did not observe any lack of the enthusiasm which such an adventure should arouse. The boy who had designed the rescue was to lead his followers to the schoolhouse door, place his shoulder against it, and with a war whoop push it in upon the astonished occupants of the room. His followers were to imitate his example, and the schoolmaster was to find himself bound hand and foot before he had recovered from his astonishment. The only trouble the first boy apprehended in the whole affair was lest the boys behind him should, in their eagerness, press upon him so severely as to injure him. The line of boys approached the door. The first

boy put his shoulder against it. He looked around upon his comrades, gave his signal, and as a deafening roar arose from a dozen throats, in he rushed. The schoolmaster stood upon the threshold and quietly grasped him by the collar. And where were the boys whose unrestrained fierceness the leader had feared might overwhelm him and spoil the success of his plan? They stood timidly without, looking in at the door to see what the master would do with the ring-leader.

Many a minister gets himself into situations much like this. He proposes something to his people, and they assent, as people often do without respect to what they really think. He rushes in, expecting to be followed by a line of people who in their eagerness to assist him will almost crush him. And when he finds himself in the presence of the enemy he finds himself there alone. The most anyone will do is to look in and see how it fares with him. When such a thing happens, the minister usually feels himself tremendously aggrieved, reproaches mankind in general and his own parish in particular for its dullness. But nine times out of ten it is the minister's fault. If the thing he wishes to do really ought to be done, he can get plenty of people to help him do it, if he will take the time and have the patience required. And if he rushes into things into which no one will follow him, let him blame himself and learn from his experience.

Some of you perhaps have read Mr. Sheldon's book, "The Crucifixion of Philip Strong." Philip Strong — not Wise, Green, or Young — went into a community in which he had no acquaintances whatever. He walked up and down the streets a few times, and made up his mind what ought to be done. He announced that he would preach upon the social aspects of Christianity, and before he had been in town three weeks he had told his people that they must leave undone all the things they had been doing, and do all the things that they had been leaving undone. He waited a month, and then made to them propositions more startling than his original one. Waited a month longer, and made others that were still more novel and revolutionary. His people, of course, as anyone but a crazy man would have anticipated, rebelled, and would do nothing. He died of a broken heart.

What a comic tragedy! Grant that all the things that Philip Strong wished his people to do were wise things, — about which there might undoubtedly be a good deal of difference of opinion, — but grant that they were all without exception wise and practical; then all that was necessary was for Brother Strong to exercise a little judgment, and after that a good deal of patience, and he could have got them done, and he wouldn't have split his church to pieces, nor killed himself either. As it was he did both, and did

both without accomplishing any of the things which he set out to do. And the melancholy thing about the story is that it is calculated to give the impression that all this was the fault of the people and not the fault of the fresh and hare-brained minister.

Or, to leave hypothetical cases, I knew a man who took a church in Connecticut a few years ago. He looked the ground over, decided that the church ought radically to revise its policy owing to changes in its environment, spoke to the people about it, found that they did not respond, scolded them, accused them of running their church as a mutual admiration society, got mad and got everybody else mad, drove off a lot of his best folks, and finally took himself off without accomplishing a single one of the things which he deemed absolutely essential. Since then another man has gone to the same field, handicapped by the rashness and impatience of his predecessor, and, by merely taking a little time to it, has actually done without the least friction all the things which the first man proposed to do.

People are slow. They have a great variety of things to think of. The minister hatches a plan in his own brain, and, after thinking about it continuously for a month or even a year, springs it upon his people, who have never even dreamed of it. Then he is surprised to find that they do not take up with it at once. He cuts off a shoot

from an idea that has been growing in his mind for months, and drops it into the minds of his people, where it falls among an infinite deal of rubbish that will hardly give it a chance to get root even with time; and then he is astonished and discouraged because the next day this has not grown in the minds of his people to the same size which it has reached in his own. One can hardly believe without experience how slow people are. I have preached to one congregation now for eight years. Among other things I have preached in season and out of season, whenever I could work it in by hook or by crook, the doctrine of non-partisanship in local politics. After election last fall a very intelligent man in my congregation remarked to me — perfectly innocently — that he did not scratch his ticket for sheriff, "because," said he, "I have always voted a straight ticket." Evidently all I had said in eight years upon this subject had failed to make the slightest impression upon this good man's mind. And yet he is exactly the man who can be depended upon to do whatever he sees should be done. But people are *slow*. No one has quite so much need to let patience have her perfect work as the Christian minister.

It has been often enough asserted that if a man is to succeed in the ministry he must have a genius for labor. Beside that I place the statement that he must also have a genius for relaxa-

tion. The Lord deliver us all from a tired minister. Of all human beings he is the most doleful. In the pulpit and out of it he is a wet blanket. Nobody wants to see him, nobody wants to hear him. The world is tired enough as it is. And things look blue enough to it. To be preached to by a lump of biliousness or a bundle of nervous prostration cannot make it wiser or better.

Virility is always the demand of the pulpit. That a man should have himself in hand, so that he cannot merely do something but can feel like it,—can relish his work and do it as if it were play,—is one of the things that make a minister's work go well. But energy must have a chance to accumulate. It is like money; all spending and no saving soon makes an end of it. Among the necessities of human life work comes first, and play comes next. In the analysis which Dr. Stuckenberg made of our community, you observed that among all the social forces, play holds a place next to the top. And this is true of the mass of the people in this and other communities. If, now, you consider the ministers of this or any average community, and see how almost every one of them keeps pegging away at his work from one week's end and from one year's end to another, you would have some clue to the fact that the average of spirits and of cheerfulness in the Christian ministry is so often below the average of the same qualities in men at large.

The reason so many ministers take a bilious view of the world and its inhabitants — why they think things are going from bad to worse, why they become misanthropic and hopeless, and so a burden upon the community and a block in the way of progress— is because they have in their lives so little of the element of recreation. You cannot make a good minister by relaxation, but you can spoil a good one by the lack of it. Of all men in the world the minister needs to look out upon human life with an unjaundiced eye and a sane and wholesome mind. But people who are always tired are never exactly sane nor largely wholesome. Things never look to them as they really are. I know more ministers than one whose sermons, whose theology, whose total view of human life would be improved fifty per cent if they would merely take their share of wholesome recreation. Cheerfulness is one of the minister's qualifications; and cheerfulness in most instances is merely a symptom of good physical condition.

As to methods of recreation, every man must choose for himself. What is work to one man is play to another. And let the minister, in seeking recreation, get rid of the conventionalities of his profession. Whatever he can personally do with a clear conscience, and with delight and refreshment, let him do, and let the elderly ladies think whatever seems to them appropriate.

And this leads me to say—for it lies next door to what I have been saying—that many ministers fail of their best usefulness because they have no knowledge of men. They know theology, they know history, they know books, but folks they do not know. I have been absolutely surprised, not to say chagrined, at the things that will be said by a lot of ministers in consultation. Take the average ministers' meeting; let any topic that pertains to the popular mode of living or thinking come up,—such for example as theater-going, Sunday newspapers, or the enforcement of the prohibitory law,—and nine ministers out of ten will give utterance to sentiments that nine business men out of ten would merely laugh at. They will almost invariably betray the fact that as to how people actually live, what people at large actually think, and how the world looks to the folks that live in it, they have no conception. And this, I take it, is the reason why the ministers, with the assistance of some well meaning people, are always rushing into some movement for the regeneration of the world, in which they expect to be followed by the sober element of the community, and why they are always complaining when in most of their devices for making the earth into a kingdom of heaven instanter the business men and the people generally will not sustain them. If I had to leave the enactment of the laws of this State to the men of

any calling, I should consider them safer in the hands of the blacksmiths, or the carpenters, or the bricklayers, than in the hands of the clergy. That is not because these other men are more intelligent than ministers are, it is because they know the people so much better. This is the reason, I take it, why in times past the world has never prospered when the clergy have had a monopoly of things. It has always been the weakness of the ministry to be separated from the people. Therefore I say that anything that can bring a minister into better touch with folks is a source of strength to him. And while the world is so full of people, why should we go to second-hand sources for our information about them?

What is the separation of one class of men from another, about which we talk so much, but the natural and inevitable result of the ignorance of one class of men as to the lives of other men? The world is occasionally cursed by a worldly minister, but an unearthly minister is no blessing, and he is a good deal more common. The minister who knows books and not men may be learned, profound, and even spiritual; but he will put people to sleep, he will drive them away, he will engender a popular distaste for religion; the minister who knows men, even if he does not know books, may be crude, he may be illogical, unphilosophical, but he will at least be human,

and all kinds of people will find something in his ministrations to do them good. But for that matter, there is no reason why a man should be ignorant of people just because he knows something about books.

I name one more essential of success in the Christian ministry of to-day. And that is progressiveness. It is not so much a question of being liberal or conservative, as those words stand for definite theological positions; it is a matter of being on the move. No minister can preach for a long time to the same congregation acceptably unless he grows. I do not care how good a preacher he is; if he is the same kind of preacher at the end of one year as he was at the beginning of the year before, people will have become tired of him. I do not care how liberal he is, how much ahead of the times, a man cannot very well have any following if he himself stands still. He need not have an itching for something new, he need not plunge ahead just because he feels he must, without reference to whither he is going; but as God has made it possible for him, he must move. When people see the same scenery every time they look out of the window, they soon become tired of riding, even on the gospel train. Let a man be never so good a preacher, let every sermon be a finished oration, yet if every finished oration is practically the same as the last finished oration, and so on

for ten and twenty years back, people will tire of finished orations. It is not required of a preacher that he should be brilliant, nor richly original, nor great in any particular, in order to interest people. It is necessary chiefly that he be a progressive man; that when a church ties itself to him he should actually take it somewhere, and not merely stand fastened to it like a hitching-post to a horse.

And this is equally true whether you consider matters practical or matters theoretical. The age calls for new methods. The old evangelism is a spent force. Only the man who knows what to put into its place, and has the courage and the forethought to put it there, can keep his church from going backwards.

Perhaps this is even more evident when you come to matters of religious belief. It is often said that this is an age of theological unrest. And so it is. Among intelligent people everywhere there is every day more and more dissatisfaction with the stereotyped presentation of stereotyped religious beliefs. Occasionally, of course, there is an individual who wants exactly that and nothing else. But he is rare even now, and before the most of us are dead he will belong to a species wholly extinct. While he is here it is wise not to alienate him when it can be avoided; not to scare him needlessly, nor to antagonize him. Offences must come, and they must come especially to the man who demands a type of thought which the

world has outgrown. But still it is more or less woe to the minister through whom the offence comes. Nevertheless, the world cannot wait for people who do not even promise to move; and the presence in a congregation of a few such persons should not bind the minister's tongue from the utterance of the truths in which his soul really believes. And what is more, I may be mistaken but I give it as my conviction, that every year there is less and less patience on the part of the public with ministers who are suspected of believing one thing and saying another, or who are known to be afraid to declare their honest and profound convictions, or who are so eternally cautious that they never quite speak the whole truth before they die. People do not want a minister to be blunt, and there is no reason why he should be. They do not want him to be pugilistic, and there is every reason why he should not be. But they do want him, within the bounds of tact and wisdom, to be honest and frank. They have a good deal more patience with him for the utterance of beliefs which they do not share, than for shuffling. They will welcome the courteous declarations of convictions which they do not accept rather than listen to utterances that are not convictions.

For a good many years now, ever since the doctrine of evolution began to find general acceptance among ministers, the pulpit has been full of

apology, of half-truth, of shuffling and evasion. The pulpit has felt that the old order of truth could somehow be adjusted with the new; that things which God had sundered men could, by sufficient arguing, bring together. Speaking of the ministry as a whole, and allowing for notable and noble exceptions, when the ministry has abandoned any position it has not been when it has first perceived it to be untenable, but when it has at last been positively driven away from it. This sort of thing does not increase the popular reverence for the ministry as a body of truth-loving and truth-speaking men. In all this it is time for a new order. The pulpit now has more to fear from evasion than from plainness,— provided always, of course, that the plainness be of the Christian sort. People will not be abused, they will not be sneered at or called mossbacks; but there never was a time when they were so ready to be led as they are to-day. A man need not stand so straight that he falls over backwards. He need not absolutely unbosom himself upon all occasions. But after all, honesty, in ministers as in other folks, is the substratum of all virtue.

And now if it seems to you that the things which I regard as elements of success in the Christian ministry are rather commonplace things, and that I have not enough insisted upon the considerations that are highest and most ethereal, for this there may be two reasons.

The first may be that the glory of the ministerial calling, the need of consecration, the value of piety and prayer and Christlikeness, have been sufficiently insisted upon in your hearing many times, and should anyway be taken for granted in any discussion pertaining to the Christian ministry. To insist upon these things would seem like re-enacting the moral law. And the second reason may be that I was asked to speak to you out of my own experience. That this should reflect somewhat upon the high-mindedness of the speaker is one of the unfortunate but inescapable incidents of such a situation. And yet I believe that the ministry is not by any means the only sphere—though it certainly is one of them—in which what is supposed to be over-high is often insisted upon to the absolute obscuration of that which is of as much more consequence as it is nearer the ground. The philosopher, you remember, carrying his dinner in his hand and looking at the stars, fell into the brook; and as he got out he remarked to himself that if he had only looked into the brook he might have seen the stars and not have lost his dinner.

The minister is not above the motives and considerations that appeal to other honest men, nor can he afford to look so much above the earth for all his incentives and encouragements that his feet will drop into unseen pitfalls upon his path. And, often, if he will look at what is immediately

before him and around him, he will see mirrored in that the sun from which he draws his light, and the heaven he is to try to make.

IX

METHODS OF EVANGELIZATION

BY

PROF. B. F. HAYES, D. D.,

Professor of Apologetics and Pastoral Theology,
COBB DIVINITY SCHOOL.

Methods of Evangelization

Evangelization in its original sense meant the spreading of good news. The breadth of scope in the great commission to the disciples of Christ has been gradually coming into the vision of men, till now it is seen to include such a conveyance of the teaching of Jesus respecting the Father and the right relation of men to him and to each other as shall win them to choose Jesus for master and to become like him in spirit, conduct, and aim. That aim is to produce such prevalence of righteousness and benevolence that at length our race shall obey the divine law of love, and our Lord's prayer that the Father's will be done on earth as it is in heaven shall be answered.

There are no terms too broad or too emphatic to state the vastness of this work. It represents the highest thought known to us in God's plan of the creation. What thoughts and what results he may have for other worlds we know not, but for this planet the goal of his ages on ages of earth's preparation, of his education of the race through the slow and painful eons of its history, and of his self-revelation in Jesus Christ, is the production of a race conformed to the image of the divine man.

Our Lord allowed his disciples to understand that they were to see his kingdom begun on the earth;* in fact that, though not yet visibly, it had already begun.† When after his ascension they began to carry abroad the good news to the nations, it is not impossible that they may have talked of finishing the work in a generation, as some in recent times have talked with no better reason for the expectation. And it is very possible they did carry their message and win converts throughout what, in the limited geography of that day, was called the habitable world. But though the number who should publish the good news increased, their capacity and fidelity, and the fitness of their methods rapidly declined.

DEFECTIVE METHODS OF THE PAST

When about three hundred years after Christ the chief evangelists were Constantine and his recently pagan army, and their method a military order that all subject tribes shall make the sign of the cross, receive baptism, and henceforth call their religion Christian, however many pagan superstitions and ceremonies it retained, Christ's idea of evangelizing the heathen world seemed lost; the political method by which the Jews formerly had expected to master the world had taken its place. This notion of subjugating instead of con-

* Luke 17: 20, 21.
† Matt. 16: 28 and 24: 34.

verting the world was the ruling idea when, the northern barbarians having trampled out the life of the Roman Empire, the Church erected an empire out of the ruins, and gave to the Bishop of Rome the title formerly borne by the emperors —Supreme Pontiff. The Church caused the conquerors of the empire to accept her religion, but it was a religion aimed not at securing obedience to God, and making men like Christ in their aims and character, but at training warriors for the subjugation of nations.

A few, with purer and holier aspirations than such a religion fostered, betook themselves to solitary self-discipline in deserts, caverns, and cloisters. This course seemed almost the farthest removed from obedience to the command, "Go preach"; but by devoting themselves to multiplying copies of manuscripts of the Gospels and Epistles, they became in an important sense successors of the first evangelists.

In the main, however, the method of Constantine continued. Instead of evangelization, it was subjugation, with regeneration by baptism and the rites and dogmas of the church, which must be accepted on pain of torture and death. Thus was extended a form of religion called Christianity, but hardly less remote from the conception of Jesus than was the religion of the Jews who crucified him. One after another the Crusades were undertaken with the belief that these would

extend the area of Christendom. The new world was discovered, and Spain's armies went forth with their priests ostensibly to evangelize, but, with some noble exceptions, only to gratify their greed for pleasure, power, and pelf.

These things are mentioned among methods of Christianizing the world because these teachers were making known to peoples who had never heard of him the name and character of Jesus as they understood him, and were seeking to make Christians in accordance with their conceptions, believing that thus they were securing to men salvation. But there was in their thought no relation of character and life to salvation.

Among them, however, were some teachers in whom, no doubt, a true and deep conversion had been wrought—men who had the spirit of Jesus, and knew he wished to send them as he was sent, to die, if need be, for men. God wrought also with such men as Ulfilas, who carried the gospel to the Goths of Germany, St. Patrick and his associates, who evangelized Ireland, Austin and his fellow monks, who taught Christianity to the Anglo-Saxons, carrying to them as seed that word from which has grown English liberty, English literature, manly character, and Christian philanthropy. God was working also in St. Francis Xavier, St. Francis of Assisi, Thomas à Kempis, the Waldenses, and the Lollards; though in all cases, then as now, the character of the agents

and their conception of their work determined their methods and limited the results. To the mass of people then religion was only a kind of commercial or governmental arrangement for escaping punishment hereafter, and to the hierarchy it was a means of present power and emolument. "How exceedingly profitable," said Pope Leo X. to the prelates around him, "has this Christianity been to us!"

Sometimes, below the cloud-bathed summit of a mountain, a fountain is found gushing from its side; but the waters soon go out of sight, trickling through the deep crevices of its rocks, to reappear farther down and flow in a fertilizing rivulet over the plain. So the stream of divine law and love that came forth from the life that conquered on Calvary was hardly discoverable during all these turbulent ages. Now and then the roots of a sincere, earnest life had penetrated to those secret streams, and been made to grow to a height and beauty and fruitfulness whose beneficent vitality resembled that of the first century.

Such in England were Wyclif and the evangelists he sent traveling over their country with parts of the Scriptures hidden in their garments to read to the people by night, when the doors were shut and the windows were darkened for fear of the priests.

Their method was a partial return to the primitive, simple method of evangelization. They read or told the story of Jesus. The awakening that resulted spread into Europe, where its influence blended with an extensive movement among the Lollards, or followers of St. Francis of Assisi, who were calling on men to live and serve as Jesus did. These movements resembled in many features revivals of later times, and they prepared the way for a greater to follow when the invention of printing and the revival of Greek learning made it possible for Erasmus to give the original Scriptures to scholars, and for Tyndal and Luther to give them to the common people in their own tongue.

It matters not that we are not wont to call the Reformation a work of evangelization. It may not have extended the area over which the story of the birth and death of Christ was known. As compared with pagan lands, Europe might have been called evangelized; but compared with Christ's ideal, it would be equally just to say it was unevangelized. The Reformation began an advance towards that ideal. It introduced the method which should be regarded as essential in all evangelization, namely, the study of the Scriptures by each man for himself, untrammeled by tradition, and the exaltation of Christ as supreme source of authority and salvation. The result has been to give a more intelligent apprehension

of what the life, death, and teachings of Christ signify, and a larger infusion of his spirit to every generation that has followed. But neither was the Reformation complete, nor were its effects entirely stable.

In England it left a large place for the use of spectacular display and meaningless ceremony. The Puritan reformation eliminated the millinery and the mummery, but was so erratic, both in what it rejected and in what it retained, that its natural product was blear-eyed consciences and one-sided Christians, tithing mint, anise, and cummin, but despising many things now seen to be essential to symmetrical character, to high usefulness and happiness. It restricted the use and culture of the imagination, disdained the production and enjoyment of the beautiful, dwarfed the social side of nature by putting under ban many sources of innocent joy, the play instinct, and the expression of affection; and, worst of all, it failed to give love its supreme place either in the character of God or of good men.

Puritanism retained still as an inheritance from the dark and superstitious ages the notion that God works, not by means and according to laws, but by an immediate occult action of his power, and that Satan and other spiritual beings can act on man in the same magical way. They also retained a notion, coming from Augustine through Calvin, that the number of the saved and the

lost was fixed by a divine decree irrespective of what individuals might be and do, and that evangelization being the Lord's work, the sending of missionaries to the heathen or any direct effort on the part of parents for the conversion of their children would be an unwarranted or impatient and useless interference with the Divine prerogative, because whatever he pleased to do, he would, in his own time and way, accomplish.

At the same time, though in logical contradiction to this doctrine, they retained the belief, inherited from the dark days before the time of Constantine, that people can be made Christians by a rite officially administered, either as a means of working some magical purification in the subject, or of gaining for him by a meritorious ceremony a title to covenanted mercies, so that if he died in infancy his salvation would be secured.

This was a method of evangelization that left out of sight the purpose of our Father to secure in his children righteousness of character and the service of love. It made piety to consist in ceremonious observances and pharasaic severities instead of charity and mercy and habitual obedience of the heart and life to the will of God.

Such was the religious condition of the most evangelized portions of Europe and America after seventeen and a half centuries.

Why had evangelization remained so low in grade and so limited in extent? Is not He who

planned it almighty? Did not the Son of God when assigning the work to men say, "All power is given unto me?" Why, then, so little progress in all these centuries?

This question would seem unanswerable had we only that view of God's methods that once prevailed, namely, that whatever God undertakes is accomplished immediately and perfectly by a fiat of his will; but later discoveries respecting his methods in general point us to the answer of the question in the facts: (1) That the method of God is not to force progress from without, but to secure its unfolding from within. This is an accelerating process, and the rate of progress in the development of human society now going on, slow as it seems, is as rapid as any of the eonic processes through which the earth passed in preparation for the birth of man. (2) That to whatever in the course of nature is assigned a long prenatal period and a long period of infancy, there is a correspondingly long and important maturity. (3) That all God's works for the completion and improvement of the world for men are carried on through men. So all his works for the improvement of man himself are carried on through men; and the rate of progress of these works, even the highest, depends upon the capacity and fidelity of the human agents.

When this last is considered, we see that since Christ ascended, God's work of human evangeli-

zation is carried on by methods which men invent and adopt. And when we consider what the agents and their methods have been, we see that the work could not have proceeded otherwise than as slowly, and with as imperfect results as history shows. The growth and education of the human race and the progress of Christianity seem to be epitomized in the life of an individual. There is an infancy of slowly awakening faculties, emerging from animalism into the life of conscious responsibility; then a self-asserting, and at times turbulent and boisterous youth, followed by a passage into young manhood with higher aims, settled purposes, and better methods.

Whether we should consider Christendom as now at the beginning of young manhood the historians of the future can judge better than we. But we certainly can claim no higher ascent. The Holy Spirit is always ready to inspire, but inspiration can be received only according to the capacity of the recipient.

The religion of a man, and so of a people, always corresponds, in the main, to the mental and moral grade of the person or his time; though the lower the grade of both, the more likely the individual and the church are to think their conception is the perfect and final religion. Thousands, no doubt, have lived and died as good Christians as they knew how to be, ignorant that

the world's evangelization was waiting not so much for more Christians as for a better kind of Christians.

APOSTOLIC METHODS REVIVED

The world's evangelization was thus waiting at the beginning of the eighteenth century, a period in God's education of our race memorable for the appearance of agencies that have made the generations that have followed more remarkable for Christian progress than any that preceded; though some of these agencies have yet only begun their career of beneficence, and all of them, in their present stage of development, are only prophecies of higher realizations of which, however, the fore-gleams already can be seen. None of them, indeed, were entirely new. They were rather reincarnations or higher conceptions of ideas that began to find expression in the first century.

Of these agencies I will mention four. The first appeared when the Wesleys and Whitefield went forth from their Bible studies at Oxford with a message that caused men to cry out, "What must I do to be saved?" The second also began with the Wesleyan movement, but it began again independently with Robert Raikes in 1780. The third was the conception of which the realization has been progressive and constant till the present time—that it is possible to determine the laws and limitations and grounds of cer-

tainty of human knowledge, and the laws of men's mental and moral powers. This movement was begun by Emmanuel Kant and was promoted by the writings of Jonathan Edwards.

Philosophy has been feared as anti-Christian, but those who denounced it as falsehood and folly because of the incompleteness and extravagances of its early stages made a mistake similar to that of those who denounce Christianity because of its fanatical excrescences and heretical offshoots. The great inquiry begun — but only begun — in the 18th century has signally aided the establishment of truth in the field of theology.

The early Christian fathers regarded the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle as the forerunner and handmaid of Christianity; and the great progress of philosophy, with the new science of the mind of man, to which it has given rise, is no less important to the Christianity of to-day. If not distinctly a method of evangelization, it is a John the Baptist to every other method. It distinguishes the fit from the unfit in methods, and also in many cases the false from the true in doctrines. It has banished doubt from many minds that otherwise would have been, like Thomas before he saw his Lord, unable to believe.

Philosophy is an honest effort to find out the plan and method of God in order that man may think and work in harmony with it, and it finds the same principle which Christ declared to be

the sum of the law, revealed in the mind of man, and that the moral welfare of every human being depends upon his obedience thereto. Psychology has discovered God's plan as it is expressed in the human mind, and all efforts at soul-saving must conform to that plan on pain of mingling injury with whatever good they do. Does this mean that every evangelist must be a student of philosophy as well as of Scripture? By no means, any more than every man that sails a ship must be an astronomer or a mathematician; he may not know how the mathematician constructs a table of logarithms, but he must know how to use such a table; he may not know how the astronomer has discovered and proved the laws of celestial motion, but he must know how to take advantage of those laws. No less necessary is an understanding of the laws of the human mind to one who is to be a safe leader of his fellow-men.

The fourth evangelizing agency whose rise dates from the eighteenth century was even more than the others the rediscovery of a first century idea. It is that of foreign missions.

The work of evangelizing the world has two aspects: one in which the local church with its pastor assumes the work of Christianizing its own community and bringing its youth into the kingdom of Christ, the other is missionary evangelization. It includes both individual and

organized effort to win for Christ families and communities that are included in no parish, whether they live in distant lands or in the next village. Home evangelization was earliest in the history of Christianity. The disciples began at Jerusalem by the Master's direction, but they were not all to remain there. The miracle of the ages was that Christianity survived the breaking up of the Jewish nation. It did so because it had gone abroad; its preachers had not confined their labors to their own countrymen. There was power in it to meet the needs of humanity; that power working through a few heretics, as Paul and his companions were called, transformed the religions and reformed the customs of the then civilized world. The law that was illustrated then is the law to-day. Christianity must evangelize; that it make conquests is the condition of its life; and its field is still the world. Every wise and faithful pastor will secure the practical interest of his people in foreign missions. He will do this by seeing to it that they have up-to-date information that will elicit their sympathy and their prayers; and also that they are habituated to some systematic method of offerings.

It is not my purpose to discuss the methods of foreign missions, or to inquire whether these methods are all likely to continue the same as hitherto. Yet I am constrained to utter a warning against a conception of evangelization that

tends to vitiate its methods at home as well as to pervert the true foreign mission motive—the love of humanity, God's motive in sending his Son—into a false one, namely, to hasten the physical reappearance of our Lord on earth to set up a material kingdom.

An expectation of such a return was doubtless cherished by Christians of the first century as an inheritance from their Jewish training; for the Pharisees held and taught that not only would the Messiah make Jerusalem the capital of a world empire, but that their prophets and good kings and all pious Jews who had lived were to come out of their graves to share in the temporal blessings and triumphs of such a universal empire. With this hereditary teaching in their minds, it is not strange that the disciples, convinced that their Lord was alive from the dead, hastened to the conclusion that he would return, bringing the righteous dead with him, and set up the Kingdom which he said was "at hand." But the course of events refuted this opinion, and the lesson of nineteen centuries reiterates the refutation. Still the delusion has been revived by literalists from time to time along the Christian centuries; especially during the tenth was this doctrine extensively and most earnestly preached, and greatly to the enrichment of the church that then was. Wealthy people in great numbers made over their property to the church, hoping

thereby to secure a share in the joys of the millennial kingdom to be ushered in with the end of the thousand years from the birth of Christ.

This materialistic literalism survives in many minds and has contributed in the last half of the nineteenth century to an expectation much like that which characterized the end of the first thousand years. One evil effect of this teaching is the tendency to discount the work of thorough evangelization in Christian lands and give the impression which is manifest in some cases, that churches have no need or reason to exist save to furnish the evangelists and the means that they may run speedily over all the earth, that then with mighty catastrophe the end may come.

The preaching of this doctrine has been regarded by many as the most effective means of evangelization, and it has often resulted in securing large numbers of professed adherents to Christianity. It was so in the years 1837 to 1843. Believing this world about to end, many people strove for a title to a mansion in the next, as when a piece of unsettled territory in the West is opened for preëmption men rush to stake out claims and locate corner lots. But when after 1843 they found the promise not fulfilled, they returned to their old life with alacrity, often leaving behind them all their former faith in preachers and gospel.

The close of the century has seen a revival of this method, and it would be no strange thing if it should count converts in great numbers; visible and material life can look so much more desirable to men than that which is spiritual. But when, as the century rolls on, the last hermit nation opens its doors to Christianity, no more to be closed, and the Gospel continues its slow work of leavening human society throughout the world, the propagators of Christianity by such methods will learn that our Lord meant more than they supposed when he said, "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations." The Church needs only to obey this command in its full significance, and we have no need to fear that Christianity will not ultimately triumph in all nations, and prove itself the universal and final religion.

METHODS OF THE PRESENT

As Christianity advances towards its goal the conception of it and of the methods of its propagation will advance as it continues to raise men to higher and higher planes of intellectual discernment and moral achievement.

In the nominally Christian lands, beside the large number that have always remained outside all Christian circles, affected only indirectly by Christianity, there is with each successive generation a new population to be Christianized, and a new army to be recruited for carrying the

Gospel into regions beyond. Hence home or parish evangelization lies at the foundation of all work for extending Christ's kingdom throughout the world.

I make no attempt to enumerate all the present-day agencies of home evangelization. Four seem to demand consideration: the home, the pulpit, the revival, and the Sunday school.

THE HOME

The first of these is doubtless the most important. When the Christian ideal of it is realized the methods and influences of the home will be more effective than all the other means of evangelization.

Such is the opportunity in the home to make sure the beginning of Christian life in children that failure here is fraught with destiny. Probably to-day the influences and the neglects in the homes of Christendom are more effective than all others together upon the decisions of our countrymen whether to be Christians or not, and upon the kind of Christians they will be. But as the principles that should guide in the home as an agency of producing Christian character, and that of the best kind, apply also in the Sunday school, they may be considered in connection with that. Let it be remarked here, however, that if any two can with special confidence rely on the promise, "If two of you shall agree on earth touching

anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father," they are the father and mother who are wisely agreed in the determination to train their children for Christian character and service.

THE PULPIT

While the duties of the pastor and the lines of his activity are diversified beyond those of almost any other servant of the public, the conversion of men and training them for Christian service are the two functions to which especially his preparation and consecration should point. The functions of the preacher cannot be adequately discharged when all his labor is bestowed upon the church and for it, while their part is to listen and admire, or perhaps criticise. The true conception of a pastor is more like that of the coach of an athletic team than that which has so often prevailed, which likens him rather to a solitary athlete performing for the entertainment of the audience that pay him! He may be thought of as the trainer and director of a company of Christian workers.

When he assumes the leadership of a church he enters at once on a study of the needs of the community and the capacities and adaptabilities of the force he is to instruct and lead. He studies also to know what further possibilities for service may be developed. He is supposed to be deter-

mined, since he loves God supremely, and his fellow-men according to his measure as Christ loves them, not to be content with simply helping his church respectably to carry on its religious routine, but rather that his church and himself shall be the leaven whose power shall constantly be felt penetrating farther and farther into the lump that surrounds them.

This purpose can be realized. It can be undertaken in this twentieth century with greater confidence than at any previous period in modern times, notwithstanding all the rivalries of worldly interests, all the loosening of doctrine, and the vacillations of faith. But all depends on the fulfilment of conditions. When the spring freshet is of unusual depth, after frosts have been severe and snows have been deep, the farmer may doubt of his summer's crop. Just now he has something else to do instead of the usual plowing and sowing; he must see that his bridges are made fast, their culverts and the ditches kept open; and the flood, though it may here and there undermine an old tree or move a fence, will penetrate to the deepest roots of all that is alive, and will leave fertilization behind it. And so, just because of the unusually hard winter and severe freshet, the sagacious farmer will have a cleaner, less vermin-infested, and heavier crop when the harvest-time comes. So, I surely believe, the present causes of trepidation are to

introduce a period in which Christian work may be done under more rational and helpful auspices, with wiser methods and more abiding and valuable results than ever before.

But all this depends on conditions, as the realizing of the harvest depends upon the fulfilment of conditions all the season through. But it may be said with even more certainty to every pastor and working church, "You will not fail to be leavening your lump, you will be ever adding to your numbers those that are being saved, provided you fulfill the conditions, provided you conform to the laws by which God works through men, women, and children for the saving of other men, women, and children." But little progress can be made toward the result while getting around or away from these conditions. A first condition is a consecrated membership in the churches,—a membership whose purpose is to habitually obey the will of God in the daily routine of home and business; who make not self-pleasing, but Christ's law of love the law of their lives; who are willing to spend time and thought and whatever they have to spend in order helpfully to influence other people.

How can a pastor have in his church such members? He can at least be one such himself. Until he is, he can do little toward securing such a character in others. The pastor can know that his purpose is not selfish. He can know, and he

should know, that with his mind and his will and at least at times with his affections, he obeys Christ's supreme law of love to God and to men.

If with this he has the shepherd instinct that goes after the strayed and the lost, and if he has the knowledge and the aptness that fit him to teach, and the ability and desire by his uttered thought and his personal presence to impress, persuade, and inspire his fellow-men — a combination of qualities that constitutes a call to the ministry — then his church has a leader in the work of evangelization.

And happy is that pastor who has a church of like spirit; who do not cast their eyes down or sleep, but listen with cheerful faces when he explains the conditions of loving service and invites to its rewards; and who give the encouragement of sympathetic countenance, also, when he instructs the young or reasons with the undecided. Almost every congregation has much to do with the making or the unmaking of the preacher as they sit in the pews before him.

Think of Jesus saying as he sat for the last time with the eleven, and looked the love of his divine soul into the faces of that not strikingly intelligent group, "Ye are they that have continued with me in my temptations." One can easily imagine that many times came up before him when, yearning to help them, he had given his parables to stolid multitudes that thronged

eagerly enough to hear him, and then, like the swine, trampled his pearls beneath their feet because these were not what their brutishness desired; and then the expectant faces and trustful attention of these friends, and their request for fuller explanation afterward, had made the trial from the indifference and hard-heartedness of the multitude far less than it would have been. The silent sympathy of the disciples had helped Jesus to preach his gospel. It takes a preacher and a sympathetic flock—at least a faithful few, who will continue with him in his temptations—to preach the gospel effectively to-day.

THE PARENTS AND THE PREACHER

These were the two primitive agents for the propagation of religion. They were so in the pre-Christian time, for prophet and preacher are one. The functions of the preacher have changed with the centuries. They will continue to change. They will not diminish in importance and responsibility as the preacher becomes more and more distinctly the leader of all those who are carrying on the work which Christ "began to *do and teach*" for the education in religion of our race. And yet as an evangelizing agency the preacher alone, and indeed the whole church, is subordinate to the parents. Baxter was not wrong when he said, "Public preaching is appointed for the conversion of those only that have missed the blessing of the first appointed means"

—the home. Yet those who have missed this means because not born in Christian homes must be converted, or there will never be a regenerated humanity. For them there are two other agencies—the revival and the Sunday school. Concerning the first I expect to show that the charge that it has seemed to lose power, and that its good effects are not such as abide, rests on sufficient reasons. At present it is a bruised reed, not broken nor to be broken, but of itself quite inadequate even with its former basis revised and with its former methods readjusted to extend or even maintain at their present strength the churches, should they depend on it chiefly. But with such revision and readjustment it may yet have great efficiency, as under the preacher it becomes an adjunct and coadjutor to the Sunday school. The latter, it will be shown, may be expected to develop into the grand gospel method of the future.

THE REVIVAL

Among Protestants generally the word "revival" no longer means only the return to life of a moribund church, but especially the bringing into the church of converts then first made alive. In this sense of the word revivals have been regarded by many churches as practically the only method of augmenting the number of Christians. And the sentiment is uttered as though it were an

axiom, that, if revival methods fail, an end of churches will follow and future generations will be infidel.

That revivals have greatly declined in frequency seems to be undeniable. Dr. Pentecost, one of the most efficient of living revivalists, is reported to have said, "The Moody revival is a spent force." The united testimony of the bishops of the Methodist church declare the same to be approximately true of the Methodist revival. A meeting of representative Christian workers in Montreal bears witness that the "after-meeting" has lost its power. The more influential religious journals have expressed opinions like this from *The Watchman* of Boston: "The revival in the sense of machinery for producing certain spiritual results probably has gone." The churches seem to have endorsed this verdict, for it is reported that the association which formerly advertised to furnish to order revivalists adapted to any community and the purse of any church, has few calls, and many of its workers have become pastors or betaken themselves to other callings. The question that many ask with solicitude if not despair is, "Can the old-time prevalence and efficiency of the revival be restored?" With reference to this matter it should be understood, more generally than it appears to be, that the decline of desire and effort to promote great revivals is not because Christians have apostasized

from Christ, lost interest in their fellow-men or faith in the Gospel. Doubtless it is admitted among all intelligent and progressive Christians that the average of Christian life and service is far below what it ought to be, yet he has failed to understand the past or to interpret the present justly who does not know that, with all its defects, a better quality of piety distinguishes Christendom in this generation than in any other that has lived.

Christianity is a force in the world that will continue to evangelize. If a method that has been thought best should be superseded by another, it would be but a repetition of what has happened before with good results. Revivals of some kind, however, will recur so long as working churches exist. Their principle is apostolic and in accord with human nature, which cannot, amid the great variety of objects for thought and action, be at all times equally and supremely interested in any one enterprise, however important. But it is necessary that Christians should at some time and in some way be supremely interested for the salvation of their fellow-men. If, therefore, "the revival as machinery," the revival as the past has known it, is gone, and cannot be restored, it must be because progress in knowledge is disclosing some need of improvement in the machinery that will leave the old unused, as the fireplace and crane, indispen-

sable as they were in the homes of our ancestors, have given place to inventions that perform their service better. A conclusion that the revival methods of the past need to be similarly replaced and that a restoration to their former repute is impossible, seems to be warranted by various facts.

In the first place, the revival methods have depended for their success largely upon the enthusiasm of crowds, and the general and prolonged concentration of attention of the unconverted. Both these conditions are now rarely attainable. Every community has abundance of non-Christian people, but their attendance at revival meetings and their concentration of attention, especially in large and intelligent communities, is not secured. One reason is the multiplicity of other things that preoccupy attention. Formerly the themes of public interest were few. After the struggle for daily bread, always paramount, religion, when once attention was called to it, had few rivals in the claim for thought. Of reading there was little; no telegraph, no associated press, no engrossing news from the antipodes to furnish themes of thought and discussion, and easily would the revival become the one thing attracting and concentrating attention, and heightening interest by day-after-day presentation of subjects of supreme moment.

How different is all this to-day! The revival

meetings are competed with by the clubs, by the meetings of lodges—their festivals and their excursions, by the discussions and socials in the grange, or the popular amusements demanding more nights than the week affords. Now the evangelist finds not only rival claimants for attention, but confident antagonists. One of these is the literature that in magazines and novels of all grades, in books upon socialism and hosts of other "isms," and in the daily, the weekly, and the mammoth Sunday newspapers, storms and drifts over all the country.

The modern intensity of school life and of social life, the white heat of business competition, and more often than formerly the fever of passion, unite to harden character into permanent forms in very early life. And, where no moral or religious training accompanies these early influences, the young man and woman have usually chosen the hostile side. They are not, as young people formerly were, living with an expectation or desire that the revival may bring them into the church. The associations they have chosen perhaps include some labor organization, or some business whose leaders advise them to shun the church as an enemy.

Multitudes appear to think that their supreme, perhaps their only, interest is in this life; and that the churches concern themselves entirely with the next. Hence they imagine that between

them and the churches no point of contact exists, and that the church's message ignores more truth than it brings, and is therefore not worth hearing.

How else can one reasonably account for the vast difference between the attendance on Mr. Moody's meetings in 1873 to 1877 and those held since 1893, in which the audiences were said to consist almost entirely of church members?

A brother furnishes me the following facts, gathered chiefly from the published Minutes of the Maine Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They would probably be paralleled in the churches of any denomination where revivals employing similar methods have occurred.

He says: "Some years before I was pastor at ——— there was a revival, and ninety-four persons were taken on probation into the Methodist church. The records showed that only ten of these were ever taken into full membership." Between 1894 and 1898 the circuit or pastorate of ——— and ——— was reported as enjoying a series of "remarkable revivals." The pastor had employed the usual revival methods. The number of converts in the largest revival was seventy, the aggregate three hundred. Before the "great revival" occurred, the church numbered, according to my informant, one hundred members. In 1894 the pastor's salary of $425 was paid in full without missionary aid, and $45 for various benevolences. But in the year fol-

lowing the "great revival," the same salary was paid only with the help of $75 missionary money. In 1898 the succeeding pastor found a church of one hundred and eight full members! The benevolent contributions were a few dollars more than in 1894, and the pastor's salary was $525; but it was not all paid; there was a deficiency of $50. Where are all those converts? What did they ever do for the church or for the kingdom of God? What were they converted from, and what were they converted to?

Looking over the statistics of a list of churches that in 1894 reported revivals with from twenty-four to a hundred converts, my informant says: "An examination of these charges to-day does not reveal any strength as a result of these reported conversions; in fact, these churches, many of them, are losing rather than gaining."

In one well attested instance in this State, when the revivalist left, the names of ninety persons had been enrolled as wishing to lead a Christian life, but not one of them became a permanent addition to the church, nor so far as believed to any church! Doubtless many of them were still in the community, to be again reported as converts in the next revival. These may be extreme cases, but they sample the results of a certain method of evangelization, and they prove that "getting up a revival" may do very little for the salvation of men.

Will the "great revivals" of the cities exhibit in general better results than those above noted from the country? This city (Lewiston) has had five or six in the last forty years. The one of them that is still mentioned as making substantial additions to the churches is the first of the series conducted by Mr. Hammond, the worker among the children. And the last two—one of which stirred the whole city—passed like a transient fever, leaving the churches to doubt whether the general religious health was improved or not by the experience.

A writer in the *Christian Advocate* has gathered the following facts respecting the wonderful meetings held for three months in Boston in 1877, under the direction of Mr. Dwight L. Moody. From five thousand to ten thousand conversions were reported. Many joined churches within one year; but what became of the majority, and what was the effect on the permanent effectiveness of the churches? "The net gain in membership in churches engaged in that revival for five years *before* the Moody meetings was 4,686. Net gain for five years *after* and *including* the year of those meetings was 2,576; that is, only 55 per cent of the gain during five years before these meetings. The churches, roused by artificial and extraordinary stimulation, attempted to compass in three months the work of years, and

when the protracted mental and nervous strain was past, sank back like one in nervous prostration.

The opinion has been expressed that Mr. Moody, taught by experience, could not have been induced in later life to enter upon any similar effort. His work became rather an effort to instruct Christians, and rouse them to continuous individual and organized activity for others.

This meagerness of results of revivals and the transient nature of these results are facts requiring an explanation quite as much as the decline in the frequency of revivals. Doubtless the causes of both are the same, and the probable causes are so many that it is not reasonable to assume we have solved the problem by the wholesale assertion, "The churches have lost their spirituality"; indeed it is not at all certain that a large gain in spirituality would not itself lead to dissatisfaction with the old type of revival.

Certain external reasons have been given for the revival's loss of prestige. There are others in the revival itself, not necessarily and always present, but in greater or less degree common, and often regarded as indispensable. One of these is the prominence it has given to the Old Testament conception of God, rather than to Christ's representation of him. The language in which the former was conveyed was borrowed from that applied to earthly sovereigns as the

Jews knew them and thought it right for them to behave. It therefore represented God not only as absolute sovereign, but as one whose subjects were always disobedient, incurring his anger, and liable at any time to a stroke of his vengeance. No doubt this view, preached with utmost sincerity, produced great effect in multitudes of revivals beside that historic one that began from the sermon of Jonathan Edwards on "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," whose cold and pitiless logic led the minister sitting behind the preacher to pull his coat and cry out, "Mr. Edwards, isn't God a God of mercy?"

Closely associated with this is another doctrinal view, still a staple in much revival preaching, that represents the divine sovereign as so despotic that he will not, or his government so imperfect that it cannot, allow the forgiveness of a repentant prodigal till his Elder Brother has borne an equivalent of pain which pays the government for all that would have been inflicted on the prodigal had he never repented — making God an exacting despot who *never forgives*, but *sells* pardon!

Strange that such a monstrous conception, formed by men in an age when love and mercy in human sovereigns were unknown, should survive so long after the explicit teaching of Jesus that the Father forgives "freely,"* making no exac-

* Matt. 18: 21–35.

tion that any one should pay, and requires that our mercy should be of the same free and benevolent kind;† authorizing us in our daily prayer to expect from him unpurchased pardon, if we can so "forgive our debtors." Sinners need forgiveness; for this the Father requires no condition but that they turn from sin with choice to do his will. They also need assurance of forgiveness; this he gives through the testimony of his love as manifested supremely in the death of Christ. But they need more than this. They need to be awakened to a true ideal of life, so that they may repent; need to be awakened to love, so that they may loyally serve; and for this the love-life and the love-death of Christ afford motive, encouragement, and inspiration. The substitution of this glorious conception for the old forensic notion takes away the legal terms that revivalists were wont to conjure with, but it makes the personality and teaching of Christ and his sacrifice of himself far more potent realities to those who aim to live the life of the Spirit, and to "put on Christ."

A third characteristic of revival preaching that has doubtless won many to swell the roll of reported converts gave the impression that to be saved from sin means merely to be saved from the penalty of sin; the penitent had only to believe that Christ has fully borne his penalty,

† Matt. 6: 14.

and he is "saved to the uttermost," because he has the benefit of some mysterious transaction done in heaven "long time ago." From such preaching the belief is inculcated that to be "saved" is to accept from without a gift; that religion is something to get, ready-made, from above. Once throngs flocked to such preaching, eager to get something for nothing.

But when all people are taught that conversion is the soul's act turning itself to God in response to solicitation from him; that his solicitations reach receptive minds in an almost infinite variety of ways; that we become Christians, not by believing any abstract statement of doctrine nor any number of such statements, but by affectionate trust in the personality of God that disposes us to do his will in imitation of his divine Son; and that "experiencing religion" means transformation of character into the likeness of Christ, gradually wrought through our coöperation with the ever-present Spirit of God who works in us,—converts supposed to be made Christians in a moment will be fewer, but the number of intelligent Christians will not be less.

Another stimulant for increasing the number of converts is remembered by people who heard the preaching and the exhortations in the annual revivals of forty years ago, and recall how full they were of death-bed scenes and entreaties to young and old to get ready to die. Young con-

verts, though children, would catch the prevailing phraseology, and exhort their young companions to forsake the vanities of this life, because they too might soon die. If revivals were thus helped to gather numbers—and who can doubt it?—they must lack that help now. Does anybody want to go back to that cant even if the preaching of the present day is less favorable to excitement? Is it not better that preachers should teach as they now do, that religion is for the life that now is as well as for that which is to come, and that to be spiritually alive is to live through the tasks and associations of every day in loyal obedience to the Christian law of love to God and man?

A belief has commonly prevailed in revivals, often seeming to be the basal doctrine, that emotional excitement is the proof of the presence of God, and that happy feelings are the substance or "power of religion." This once made the excitements called "great revivals" easy to produce, but worthless in their effects. Then the recipe for producing them was substantially this, as given by a famous revivalist of fifty years ago: "First shake sinners over hell till they are terrified; then show them that Jesus bore the penalty for their guilt, and if they will believe it they may shout, 'Hallelujah, 'tis done.'"

Doubtless there are communities and parts of the country where this kind of revival will be

long in going, where "mourners" will be brought to the anxious seat by lurid descriptions of everlasting burnings of physical bodies in a lake of fire — such as a Western evangelist not long ago employed, describing the lake as the molten center of our planet, whose flames appear in the fires of our volcanoes, or as appeared in the sermon which so frightened Georgie Howe in "The Bonnie Brier Bush"; which is no exaggeration of what I myself heard from a famous evangelist now living. This literalizing of the symbols of Scripture is not now possible for Christian workers who are wise, nor would people be willing to hear it; not because people generally are too fastidious to hear the truth and the whole truth, when they are given nothing but the truth; neither is it because the consequences of sin are less terrible and inevitable facts than the figures used by our Lord represent.

But the truth is, that punishments come only because as natural consequences they must, not because the Father is vindictive. If men choose to be out of harmony with him and with the conditions of their own welfare, not even his infinite love can prevent their misery. He wishes the well-being of all his children. He works for it in every way by which wisdom or power can promote such an end. True religion will gain, when all sinners are taught that every man makes his own hell, and that the only salvation consists in

harmony of will and affection with the love and will of God. Then men will cease to seek a religion to be put on them, ready-made, as a charm against hell torments, and the kind of revival that makes "getting happy" the substance of religion or the chief sign of its presence will altogether disappear. Indeed, it is the elimination of this method of evangelization already taking place that has caused much of the fear expressed lest "soul-saving" were "becoming a lost art." This kind of revival declines because people advance in knowledge both of the laws of mind and of the purpose of the gospel; because they have learned that no transition from fear to joy, nor any other feeling, is certain evidence of conversion; because the value of a feeling is in the results to which it leads. Its value cannot be known till its results are seen.

People are now sure that God does not speak to us so directly in our emotions as in our thoughts; that emotion is always secondary — that feelings rise out of our intellectual activities; that they come with exciting thoughts, whether the thoughts are true or imaginary; and thus many strong emotional experiences are attributed to the Holy Spirit that are from quite different sources. We draw near to God in our thoughts before we can in our emotions. We draw near to him far more in our wills when in the absence of all

emotion—save such as comes with the thought of God and is spiritual sympathy with him—we will to be in harmony with his will.

Have we not found sufficient reason for the present decline of the revival in its inexact theology, its unwarranted symbolism, its false conception of what conviction, conversion, and a saved person are? But what will be its future?

When the first transatlantic cable was laid, and messages were conveyed under the ocean from continent to continent, almost boundless expectations were aroused. These anticipations were destined to be realized, not however by that first cable. Its efficiency at length began to decline. The electrical current was redoubled, but this, instead of restoring its efficacy, only showed more plainly the existence of defect and hastened its total failure. The like fate seems to be overtaking the old-time revival. Between the time of Whitefield and now, seasons have been when to bring the whole nation into the kingdom of Christ seemed easy. The anticipation will be realized, but the indications are that it will be by other methods, not those that roused the expectation. An attempt to increase to its former efficiency the old machinery unchanged will only make its inadequacy more apparent, and hasten its removal.

But it may be said those imperfect conceptions of doctrine and crudities of method that have

given form to the revival hitherto and are perpetuated in its results, are now an outgrown inheritance from the past, and may soon be only a disused heirloom. Their place will be taken by better statements of doctrine and fitter methods, and the work of evangelization will go on as rapidly as it has ever been reasonable to hope. This we may believe. But as the promise of the first cable was fulfilled only in others, so when the revival shall have been fully adjusted to the needs of the time and the present work of race redemption, it will have become another, or rather, like each ocean cable of to-day a part of a grand system of methods, doing a greater work, and performing it better than those who thought the old methods perfect could imagine.

Among the reasons for believing this, is the wide-spread and growing conviction that the revival alone does not and cannot yield the kind of churches and of Christians on whom the world's evangelization may safely depend. It is true that many Christians of the noblest character and service have come into the churches in revivals, and perhaps in some communities and denominations the majority. That has certainly been true in past times. The explanation is, that was the prevailing method; the revival was the only time when the door into the church was thought of as open, and all persons conformed to the universal expectation. Besides, it is generally found that

Christians of this kind have become converts in early life, or had received early training under the influence of some Christian teacher in home, in school, or in Sunday school. This fact, therefore, is no proof that the revival is still an adequate methed, or even a good one.

THE METHODS OF THE FUTURE.

In this discussion of the methods of evangelization it is assumed that the Scriptures are the evangel itself. From them every method derives, or at least claims, its sanction. The methods of successive ages have yielded richer blessings as one after another they have brought the Scriptures into the thought and life of men. Wicliffe was the Morning Star of the Reformation because he released the Scriptures from their prison in dead languages; Tyndal made reformation possible because he fulfilled his vow to make the plowboys acquainted with the Scriptures. "Back to the Bible!" was Luther's war-cry. "Back to pentecost and the apostles!" became the watchword after Wesley's time. "Back to Christ!" has been the motto of the last decade. But the movement in all this time has been a forward and upward one.

A better knowledge and a wider use of the Scriptures have been accompanied by better modes of evangelization. Interest in the study of the Scriptures was never so intense or so universal as now. It is difficult to realize under

how much greater light than ever before the study is prosecuted. It is becoming more and more evident that stable faith and large usefulness are found chiefly in those who, like Paul and Timothy, knew the Scriptures from their youth. More and more will the Scriptures be not a fetich nor a talisman, but the evangel in the methods of the future. The Church will evangelize by teaching all persons, so far as possible, what the Scriptures are, and the best conception yet attained of the truth they convey. At the same time this work will not be accomplished except by the power of personality—by lives that illustrate the ideals and the commandments of Jesus. And this work must begin when education and the formation of character naturally begin, at the threshold of life. This indeed places the primary responsibility on the home, a responsibility which only the Christian home can fulfil. A long time ago, when Sunday schools were unknown, Baxter said that "parents' godly instruction and education of their children is God's first means of grace," and that "public preaching is appointed for the conversion of those only who have missed the blessing of this first appointed means."

Cotton Mather, the most devout and scholarly of the Puritan divines, may almost be said to have prophesied of the Sunday school, when insisting that unless the benefits of the "church dispensations" were shared by the children the

church would "die . . . a lingering death." He said, "The Lord hath not set up churches only that a *few old* Christians may keep one another warm while they live, and then carry away the church with them when they die, no, but that they might with all care and with all advantages to that care that may be, nurse still successively another generation of subjects to our Lord that may stand up in his kingdom when they are gone."

But he was thinking only of perpetuating the church through the children of Christian parents, believing there was for them a special grace which the faithfulness of parents might secure. With the church of New England in his day there was no question of general evangelization, only the perpetuation of a church of the elect. Nor does the church yet realize its full responsibility and privilege in reference to those children that are not born into Christian homes; nor do such homes all of them realize their almost boundless power over the welfare of the children given them to rear. Among the means which the church as such employs, the most effective is the Sunday school; and that hitherto has been but a Cinderella — a stepdaughter — among the church's activities. But important truths have come to light tending to show that she will yet enter into her birthright as queen of them all.

But indifferently fostered as the Sunday school has been, it is admitted that eighty-five per cent of the additions to Protestant churches are brought in through the Sunday school, and that a large majority of the remaining fifteen per cent are won because seeds of Christian truth were planted in their minds, and some dawn of religious consciousness secured in early years. If now by any means the instructions and personal influences of the ideal Sunday school can steadily reach all children, will not the work of evangelization have a success never yet enjoyed, until the Harlan Pages and even the pulpit will be but gleaners in the harvest field?

Even the revival may be regenerated; with its crudities ripened or eliminated, it may be prepared for in the church and observed as the semi-annual "feast of ingathering." This is not a dream; it is the expectation warranted by the effect of a method now in operation, and by the trend that is manifested in the present life and work of the most fruitful churches; and especially by the laws for the formation of character, and the principles of education as now understood.

These principles are not new; they are woven by the loom of God in the constitution of man: the all-comprehensive teaching of Jesus is in accord with them; they are universally recognized as applicable to the preparation of every

child for the social, the domestic, the business life he is to live. One of them is enunciated as a rule with no exceptions when we say "the child is father of the man." We understand by it that in the years of child-life, the years of play and study, a trend is given to the whole life; that as the arrow gets the direction and the momentum of its entire course while it lies on the bow touched by the string, so often while he lies in the lap of the mother the child receives the beginnings of impulse and aspiration that give him both the aim of his life and the force by which at last he reaches his mark. When any person achieves some unusual success in the world of science or letters, or is selected to receive distinguished responsibility and honor, we point our children to the characteristics of his childhood or youth that are the secret of his success; and we tell them that no person who defers till youth is past his preparation for business, for social position, or public trust, can ever be thoroughly successful, or ever cease to regret the loss of his youth. Why is it, then, that Christians have not treated the period of childhood and youth as of as much importance for the religious life as for the social or economic? Why has it been the practical belief of the church that children must live the first years of their lives in disloyalty to God? Why is it not possible to think, and to have the children think, that they are, and are to continue,

loyal to the kingdom of heaven as well as to their home and to the State into whose citizenship they are born? Why not think that the period of childhood and youth are more important as the time of preparation for building Christian character than for any other human interest? For, do we not observe that those uses of faculty that are most delicate and most highly esteemed can never be acquired with complete success except by those who begin their training in youth or infancy? No one, so far as is known, has ever shown what could be achieved by a musician, by a sculptor, by a painter, unless he was associated with great masters, and began his training in childhood or youth. Is not the formation of the character of an immortal spirit and a preparation for service in the kingdom of heaven through helping to train other spirits, a work second to no other in delicacy or in importance? And has not experience shown that those who begin late in life are usually bunglers? It would seem that the natural way to enter any kingdom worth possessing is to go in as a little child. It was a universal law which our Saviour announced when he said the children belong to the kingdom of heaven,* and only they and such as enter it as they can † — as open-minded receptive learners — can "see the kingdom."

* Matt. 19: 14; Mark 10: 14.
† Matt. 18: 3; Mark 10: 15.

If the disciples failed, as the Church has failed since, to understand their Lord it was owing to the preoccupation of their minds by a prejudice inherited from ages of ignorance that extended into the long past, in which it had been written that children were "conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity," going "astray speaking lies as soon as they were born." How else could it be when all parents were iniquitous, and all children were born into an environment of liars? But these were simply historic statements of facts. And these facts that were contrary to the plan of God were mistaken for revelations of that plan. And this mistake has persisted until on the words of Jesus and the nature of man the new lights of the nineteenth century have been turned.

Down to the first half of the century it was taught that every child's "nature is sin and that sin is guilt" to be punished; that the "very best actions" of this guilty being are in God's sight "polluted and loathsome" because, on account of the first man's sin, every child is "born accursed absolutely and totally." "This," says Bishop Huntington, "was preached with learning, logic, and as much pictorial luridness as the preacher's imagination could supply." *

The eyes of the Church are hardly adjusted yet to the light which has dissipated this darkness

* "Persuasives to Early Piety." American Tract Society, 1831. Prof. Shedd. Lectures. "Christian Pastor," p. 339.

and its nightmare; when they are fully open she will see a new force in our Lord's command, "Permit the children to come unto me." Not that we shall be seeing new truths any more than it is a new sun we greet after a long period of cloud and fog. But we shall see new applications of the laws of child nature and educational growth to the work of evangelizing our country and the world. The epoch-making discoveries of the last century were not a discovery of new substances nor forces; iron, water, and lightning are realities as old as the world; but the new applications of them as steel, steam, and electricity have revolutionized the business methods of the world. Could we be sure that the Church would soon be as wise to see, and as eager to improve her possibilities, as the business world has been, we could anticipate that the industrial progress of the nineteenth century would be paralleled by the religious and moral development of the twentieth.

Great illumination has come to many minds when they have received the truth—taught indeed by Paul and by Jesus himself—that God is always working. He puts forth his power not merely at rare crises like the moment of conversion, but he is ever working through natural forces by means and agents physical and spiritual. The child is not so much a power as a possibility, and is no more incomplete in one aspect of his being than an-

other. As a social being he can be fully developed only in society; as an observing and practical being, only in contact with nature; as a moral being, only in contact with the rights and needs of his fellow-men and all sentient existence; as a religious being, only in recognition of God and in the society of godly people; and the time and the manner of his development in all these respects are determined according to the same general laws. The application of the law of growth to religious development is possible only because every person is born with a religious constitution — with a capacity and a need to become religious; and so far as the nature of children has been studied, this constitution inclines them to religion that demands, and when developed leads to, morality and heroism such as accord with the Christian ideals. The doctrine that children have a naturally Christian mind is not new, since Tertullian taught it seventeen centuries ago. When our Saviour said of the children, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," he was teaching that they are "endowed with a natural affinity for the things of the kingdom." *

This does not mean that children are born Christians, but neither are they born reprobates nor even sinners, just as no child is born an

* Van Oostersee's "Practical Theology," pp. 467–8 Quoted in "The Christian Pastor," p. 338.

orator, a scholar, a judge, or even a man. He is simply a nucleus of possibilities that in favorable surroundings will develop into an individual fitted for service, and just as naturally also into the highest type of man, the Christ's man. Of this truth the author of "The Reformed Pastor" had more than a glimpse years ago,† for he affirms that by the faithfulness of those to whose care children are committed they may so receive the blessings of a "holy education" that they will never become "actual ungodly persons," but will become so acquainted with Christ that they will choose to please him "as soon as they arrive at full natural capacity." On the other hand, he says: "Ungodly parents do serve the devil so effectually in the first impressions on their children's minds, that it is more than magistrates and ministers and all reforming means can afterwards do to recover them from sin to God. Whereas if their hearts were first turned to God by a religious education, piety would then have all those advantages that sin hath now."

What of conversion? If children can be started towards Christian character from the cradle, is conversion left out? Certainly not. Conversion or regeneration is a turning-point, a crisis, that finds place at some time in every normally developed character. There is a natural order for the various stages of moral and religious growth

† Bushnell's "Christian Nurture," p. 59.

as there is for the stages of intellectual growth—God's "set time." He has fixed it in the human constitution. As there is a natural need and a natural capacity in every child for acquiring language very early, and after that a natural time for beginning the observation of nature, her forms, her life, and her beauty, so there is a natural time to think of and reverence the unseen Companion, who is in and behind all nature. At that time every well-born child who is in intimate association with personalities that are amiable, wise, and good begins his religious development. Later will come the period when he can intelligently make choice, or perhaps ratify and interpret an earlier choice, of the goal of his life—the person whom he will serve, and the means by which he will seek the perfection of his being. If he still has the advice and inspiration of persons of Christian wisdom and friendship the right choice will certainly be made, for it is but one more step in a course already begun, as natural a part of it as the flowering of a plant is a natural part of the plant.

Paul's conversion, with all its unique features, and the transformed life that followed it, was no exception. It is evident that he had inherited the spiritual foundation for an energetic and influential personality. He had early learned to regard the will of God, to obey his conscience always as in God's sight. When he reached the

point of turning, the question for him was not whether to break off life-long habits of known wrong-doing, but whether to continue to live conscientiously now that new light has shown him that another road and not the one he is on is the right one. His previous training had prepared him to be obedient to the heavenly vision.

Some still ask, Can there be any method by which God working through men can redeem the race from the savage triumph of selfishness that on every hand threatens society, caring not for the immorality of the means, nor for the persons by whose undoing it prospers? For ages many have wished and expected some sudden display of almighty power, apart from all means, that shall annihilate all bad men and all bad passions remaining in good men, and create at once a regenerated humanity.

When the great revival that began under the preaching of Jonathan Edwards was in progress he regarded it as the beginning of the new era when the Spirit would be poured out on all flesh. But years after, he records his disappointment, comparing the promise and the result to a tree covered with blossoms, only a few of which are succeeded by fruit.* Now centuries of study of God's operations in nature and in grace have shown us that a sudden and magical creation of a state of society is not his method. He no more

* "Christian Nurture," p. 267.

makes a renovated nation by a fiat—nor even his noblest work, a Christian man "who can stand four square to every wind that blows"—than he makes instantly a tree tall, straight, and strong, fit to be a mast and hold its sail against a hurricane.

Divine grace working with natural and human means does transform characters already mature. It can change a heathen priest into a Christian missionary, a Jerry McAuley from a vile criminal to a loving rescuer of vicious men. But the chief hope for our race does not arise in that direction. A captain who had sent out several boats' crews to rescue persons driven into the water from a sinking ship, frequently, as he saw the rescuers dive into the water after one who had gone down, had to shout, "Save those that are still swimming!" Hitherto effort has been concentrated chiefly on those already sunk in indifference, unbelief, or hostility. Bestowed upon the children it will be more fruitful a thousand-fold. Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman once asked, in an audience of five thousand persons, that all who had accepted Christ between the ages of fifty and sixty would rise, and only four stood, but when he asked that all who had accepted Christ between the ages of ten and twenty would rise "it seemed as if the entire audience was standing."

Other pastors beside Dr. Chapman are perceiving that when our Sunday schools become

"what God would have them be" our children "will come as naturally into the kingdom of God as the sun rises in the morning," and teachers in the Sunday schools will labor with the same confidence that their pupils will be loyal to Jesus that the teachers in our public schools now have that theirs will be loyal to the flag that floats over the schoolhouse.

X

OPPORTUNITIES BEFORE THE CHURCH OF TO-DAY

BY

REV. CHARLES M. SHELDON, A. M.,

Pastor of the Central Congregational Church,

TOPEKA, KANSAS

Author of "In His Steps," etc.

Opportunities before the Church of To-day

When my father began his ministry in New York State about fifty years ago, he faced certain conditions in the ministry and the church which are quite different from those which confront us to-day. In the first place, his ministry, as such, was quite well defined for him. He knew, with a certain definiteness, which might have been written out like a daily program, just what he was expected to do as a minister, and what his church was expected to be as a church. He knew, within certain clearly defined limits, that he was expected to preach and to visit his people, and the church knew for itself that it was expected to listen to preaching, and to be visited. It would not be fair to say that the limits of his office as minister were altogether defined by preaching and visiting. But in a certain true sense, the ministry was quite well bounded by the doings of these two things. Of course there were other duties incident to his calling, but it is fair to say that a large part of his time and strength went out in the doing of these two things.

There was also another fact true of his ministry at the time he began his work, and that was the fact that his social surroundings were quite simple. It was not an age of organization. Society was vastly more simple in its relations than it is at present. There were no great problems—at least not so far as furnishing subjects for preaching was concerned—like those which confront us now. There was, of course, the one great question of slavery; but the temperance question, the labor question, the race question, the housing problem, the servant-girl problem, the problem of municipal life, the relation of the church to complex social conditions—all these were practically unknown. They did not furnish subjects for my father's preaching. They were not in existence as they are to-day.

There was another fact true of my father's time which is not so true of to-day, and that was the existence of a strong and narrow spirit of sectarianism. I think it is highly probable, if I were to look over his file of old sermons—supposing he has preserved them, which is exceedingly doubtful—I should find some in which he preached quite strongly upon reasons why it was best for everybody to be a Presbyterian—for that is the church in which he began his labors. And the man on the other side of the street, the same Sunday morning, was preaching on the subject of "Why it is best for everybody in this

little village, and the world, to be a Baptist or a Congregationalist." That condition of denominational pride and narrowness furnished, in quite a large degree, the stock in trade for preaching material. But all that is changed within fifty years.

There was also another condition which entered largely into the life of my father's time, and shaped more or less definitely his work in the ministry and the work in the church, and that was the simpler home life of his age. I can well remember that our home life remained sacredly intact as long as we were children, and it was father's custom never to sit down and begin any meal in the family until every child was present, in his place at the table. It was not an age of clubs, either for men or women. It was not an age when business cares and the hurry and haste of organized life had begun to rob the family of its just rights. I think it would be safe to say that in the village where my father began his pastorate, night after night, whole families could be found gathered together in a real family circle, in their own homes. There was no multiplicity of social engagements to take either father or mother or children away from their own hearth into the circle of some other man's family.

I made the challenge, some time ago, to the people in my own city that, if they were to begin at one end of the handsomest residential street in

the place, and knock at each door in turn, on any winter evening, and enter, they would not find one family in twenty together, as a family, spending the evening, on any night of the week. They would be in some other man's house, or the young people would be at some gathering of some club, literary or amusement.

I do not know how other men feel concerning this apparent and also real loss of the simple home life which once, I am sure, characterized us as a people. For myself, I feel that it is very serious, like the loss out of our religious life of the habit of family worship; and unless we can discover something in our modern complex life which can come in to take its place as an equivalent, I am sure we are right to consider it as one of the great and serious questions facing us to-day as a people. Have we anything to correspond to that which we have lost out of our home life, as it used to exist in the simpler conditions which faced our fathers?

There is also another fact true of my father's early ministry, which is not true of the ministry and church to-day, and that is the fact that there was really no young life in the church that was recognized or used as power.

I have heard my father say that he entered the church himself, as a boy, with great fear and trembling, after he had been obliged to submit to a long list of theological and doctrinal questions,

which no man on earth could possibly answer, much less a lad of sixteen. The church seemed to do everything in its power to make it as hard as possible for him to become a member. He was brought up to believe that it was his business as a boy to keep still in a religious gathering and listen to his elders. It never entered into the minister's mind to ask the young men and young women in his church to do anything in particular for the kingdom of God. And in like manner, when my father began his ministry — at least in the first part of it — I do not think it occurred to him to take the young men and young women in his parish and use them in ways of service.

These things, then, form something of the program of my father's ministry fifty years ago — a well-defined if narrow definition of his life work and of the purpose of the church — to preach, to visit, to go to meeting, to go home again; a simpler social organization making it in one sense easier for him to perform the duties of his profession; a home life which was a part of the religious need, and which in one sense was an equivalent for the absence of young life in the church itself; the presence of a spirit of narrow and jealous sectarianism, which dominated a part of his preaching, and entered more or less strongly into the practices of his church members; and an

absence of the power of organized youth, to do service in practical ways through and by the church as an organization.

Contrast conditions of to-day with those of fifty years ago. We find that the ministry of to-day cannot so well define the reason for its existence or its daily program of activity. I do not know myself, as far as I have gone, just what a minister is. I know some things very well concerning my program in my profession, but concerning other duties I am not so clear in my own mind. I cannot draw an exact line around my profession and say, "Thus far and no farther." It seems to me sometimes that I must be more things to more men than my father ever was, or than Paul ever was, in order to rise to the dignity of the profession which I have chosen, or which has been chosen for me. I know quite well the definiteness which surrounds my preaching. At least I am able to be dogmatic for myself concerning *that*, if not for other ministers. But I am not easily convinced as to all my personal work in the ministry, and when it comes to the work of my own church, I am not able to set about it hard and fast lines of limitation. In other words, I do not know that I could write out definitely and sharply, and satisfactorily to my own mind, exactly what is always the work of my own church.

This lack of definiteness, however, does not puzzle me to the extent of hindering the work

that I know to be well enough defined. It simply leaves my program for my own ministry and the service of my own church expansively open to new methods, and new applications of the Sermon on the Mount and the general teaching of Jesus. I am glad it is not too hard and fast defined for me.

The conditions which face my ministry to-day, and yours, are also, along the line of church federation, vastly different from and more helpful than those of fifty years ago. We no longer wear out our strength in telling our people why we are this or that sect. We have learned wisdom in learning to know and love one another, and there is nothing more hopeful in the whole ecclesiastical history of the world to-day than the fact that the churches are ready, as they never have been before, to see more of the Kingdom of God and its needs than of their own individual and sectarian life.

The fact also that, in comparison with fifty years ago, our social conditions have changed from simple to complex, makes the work of the ministry and the church in a very large sense more interesting and more valuable than it used to be. We are obliged to take account of the problems that have resulted from the world's rapid growth. It is a splendid thing for us that our definition of the office of Christ in the world has enlarged, and if we do not lay as much stress now upon the value of the atonement to save the

individual as my father did, we have not cheapened or lessened the power of the atonement because we insist that its work is social as well as individual. And if we find material to-day for our preaching in the needs of the community, or a class, or a special group of individuals, it is not because we do not believe that the atonement must work on individual men, one at a time, but because we believe it is the will of God that the redemption which Christ makes possible is a redemption large enough to save socially, by saving individuals who are in social relations.

The fact also that we live in an age of organization, which may have stolen from us by degrees some of the sacred things belonging to family and home life, is not altogether a discouraging fact, if we remember that the organized life of to-day has drawn into active exercise a factor not known nor recognized fifty years ago in the young life of the time. And it is owing to this change or these new conditions which face us to-day that we are able to set before our ministry and our churches a very well defined program for activity.

There are, therefore, certain opportunities facing us at this moment, so clearly known, so well defined, that we shall certainly miss the very reason for our existence as messengers of God, in pulpit and in pew, if we do not accept the opportunities which face us, and let faith and love and hope go on to do the work which God wants his people to do.

I would like to mention in brief detail some opportunities which seem very clearly to offer themselves for the exercise of Christian energy in the ministry and the church of the present time, and the first of these great opportunities is the opportunity for the

(1) UNION OF CHRISTENDOM

It does not make very much difference whether we can agree upon a definite theological or doctrinal statement in our different denominations. It is doubtful whether we shall ever be able to agree in any such dogma in the way of belief or creed. The great and essential thing is that we agree upon the need of a common humanity for the life which Jesus came into this world to give to all men alike. It might be an absolute impossibility for five or six different denominations in the average town in the United States to agree upon any statement or statements, theologically. But it is within the reach of any such group of churches to-day to agree upon the common necessity of the human beings, in the towns where they all live, for a better life in this world, and redemption for the world to come.

One of the most useful parts of my own parish work has consisted in the work which I have been able to do with the brother who is in the adjoining church of the Presbyterian denomination. We have, during different years, made our parish calls together, beginning at the

limits of our two parishes, which lie together, and calling in person on every family within the boundaries of the two parishes. I think that no one thing that either of us has been able to do in the way of parish work has ever accomplished quite so much in the way of unity as has this custom. It could be followed out successfully in hundreds of communities. The sight of two brethren of different denominations, going together through their parishes, inviting every man, woman, and child to come to service or to belong to some part of God's work, is a sight which will do more in a short time to break down denominational lines, and build up a true federation of Christ's disciples, than possibly any other one thing. If Christendom does not come together in practical ways for the building up of God's kingdom, it cannot expect to succeed in individual churches in building up Christ's work.

There is another meeting ground where all ministers and churches of to-day ought to be doing service for the Kingdom, and that is along the line of what is called

(2) TEMPERANCE

After a residence of twelve years in a Prohibition State, I am more and more convinced that there is no other way for the State to deal with the liquor business except to prohibit it altogether by law, and I think it is

quite safe to say that the overwhelming majority of all the ministers and church members in the State of Kansas of all the different denominations are in favor of retaining our law upon the statute books, and of continuing the policy which was begun nearly twenty years ago. This opinion is shared by the best men and women in the State, lawyers, editors, school teachers, and, to a large extent, the best business men.

For myself, I do not see how the ministers of to-day, or the church of to-day, can either ignore this question, or pass it by with an occasional sermon, or go positively on record for license, either high or low, or any other form of compromise with a business which is sin. There is a solemn obligation laid upon every minister, and upon every church of Christ in the world to-day, to do its share, positively and fearlessly, in view of the tremendous evil flowing out of the entire drink business. To shirk our responsibility, or to ignore the question altogether, is to miss an opportunity of the time! There is no moral question in America to-day which is equal to the question of "Saloon or No Saloon!" There is no one thing which is doing more to destroy the life and to sap the strength of the people than this monster of all the ages.

Instead of preaching a sermon on some doctrinal topic, it would be a good thing for every minister in the United States to take out of the daily papers he reads between two Sundays all the accounts of crime and disorder which can be traced directly to drink. I did that once a little while ago, taking six daily papers, from average communities, and pasting the clippings together for six days. It made a roll, which, when unwound in the church, stretched clear across it. If I had had all the daily papers of all the world, from which to take these extracts, I am confident I would have had enough, after recording all one week's crime and shame in the world directly traceable to drink, to paper the whole inside of my church, and the outside also.

In view of all that we know concerning the effects of the liquor business, it is a mystery to me how the Church of Christ in the world is doing and saying so little about it.

(3) CHRISTIAN BUSINESS

There is also, under the conditions which face us to-day in the ministry and the church, a well defined program for the minister,—especially, in calling attention to the prevalent dishonesty in the business world. This is a good place here to make what may seem to a good many people unfounded and wild charges against business methods and business

integrity. It is not necessary to do anything of the kind in order to state the truth. Will the ministers of this city ask all the business men in their congregations to tell them, with an honesty which they will be obliged to exercise at the day of judgment, how many business men in this city are conducting their business strictly on the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount or the Golden Rule? I have asked several typical Christian business men recently, in Boston, to give me a fair answer to this question. One of them said he thought probably ten per cent of all the business men in Boston would be willing to take Christ as partner into their business without shame. Another said he thought a fair average would be two per cent, and the third man said he doubted whether one per cent would be willing to do such a thing.

What shall we say of great business enterprises which contradict the private life of the man or men who have brought them into existence?

For example, here are the owners of a great steamship line, owning and running several magnificent ocean liners, which cost anywhere from a million to two million dollars each. They are magnificent examples of the skill and power of man, and make us admire the brain of the human being who can execute

such marvels of mechanical skill. The men who own and control these miracles of man's creative power are regarded as good Christian men in their homes; they belong to the church; they love their families; they give large sums to church work, to hospitals, to philanthropic enterprises; they pose as splendid examples of Christian business men at home. And yet these vessels which run between New York and Liverpool are floating saloons, filled with intoxicating drink. Men who would shudder at the thought of setting up a saloon and deriving revenue from it on land, do not hesitate, in their business enterprise, to run a floating saloon at sea; and on these great vessels there is gambling unrestrained. And in addition to this, an exorbitant rate is charged for passage,—more than is just from a Christian standpoint; besides the servants of the ship being paid, often underpaid, or, through custom, paid by the passengers rather than by the company.

This is only one instance in the business world of the contradiction which exists between the business man's private life and his public life in business enterprise.

It might be an astonishing revelation to the ministers of this city if all of their business men would confess the exact facts concerning the way in which their money has been

made. I believe myself that one of the great temptations which face young men to-day in our great cities is the temptation to greed, to become rich through speculation, to attain "success"—a horrid word when it defines getting on at the expense of others or the loss of character. I believe that this spirit of unchristian business methods is a spirit that ought to be rebuked by the pulpit fearlessly—in the love of God and man, but without fear or favor, and that one of the most solemn duties which lie upon the ministry to-day is to train its young life into ways of Christian business habits. No more sacred duty rests upon the church and the ministry to-day than the duty of cleansing itself from the charge of a dual life. And before we praise men for their philanthropy in giving sums to carry on even religious work, it is our duty to insist upon it that money shall be made in clean, honest, Christian ways or not at all, and that if the Sermon on the Mount cannot be applied absolutely to a man's money making, there is something wrong,—not with the Sermon on the Mount, but with the business method.

(4) CHRISTIAN STATESMANSHIP

There is, in addition to all the rest of the opportunities which face us as ministers of Christ to-day, the opportunity of training the

young life committed to our care for public service. We need to-day in our public life, municipal and national, Christian statesmen. We have enough politicians. There ought to be a school for the training of men in Christian political life. I do not know but the time is coming very soon when the theological seminaries will have connected with them chairs of applied Christian ethics, as related to the highest forms of statesmanship; and the best thing we can do, perhaps, in the next ten years, would be to send men out of our Christian colleges and seminaries equipped for the purpose of holding office in municipal places of trust, in halls of legislation, in Congress, and everywhere else. The ministry of to-day has a wonderful opportunity before it as it faces this great need.

(5) CHRISTIAN JOURNALISM

There is also an opportunity facing the church to-day, which I believe it will see and will use, to organize and endow Christian journalism. In a town or small city of fifteen or twenty or ten thousand people, containing eight or ten or more churches, why should not these churches combine their wealth and influence, which often are very large, to establish a distinctively Christian daily paper. There is wealth enough in a city like Boston, in the churches alone, to organize and carry on suc-

cessfully a paper which would stand every day of its life for positive Christian life. I do not mean simply a paper that would have good things in it, but a paper that would have a positive program for the positive building up of the Kingdom of God in this world; as clear and definite a purpose to advocate righteousness in every part of life as the minister is supposed to have in the ministry, or the church is supposed to have in the community. It would be a paper which would not contain whisky advertisements, or any other that were contrary to the will of God; a paper that would be in the largest and truest sense free from all unnecessary and narrow political bias; a paper where the editors and reporters were all profoundly consecrated, spiritual-minded men and women, whose one great purpose was to use the entire paper for the building up of the Kingdom of God; a paper that would not be dominated by the power of money, that would represent the whole life of the nation, and stand for all that was good and true and holy in all relations of man to man.

If the churches of this city, or any other city in this country, realized their real power in the matter of wealth sufficiently to carry on such a paper, and in the matter of ability to equip it and make it what it ought to be, I do not know that there is any other one agency which

the church might produce more powerful to help the cause of Christ in the world to-day.

(6) ORGANIZED YOUTH

With all the rest that we have mentioned, there is still another opportunity, the most helpful of all before the ministry and the church of to-day. This is the training of its young life in the service of God. That which my father did not have, or did not realize that he had, we to-day possess.

There are a great many young men in the ministry, in the Middle West, who are beginning to ask themselves whether it is not the part of wisdom to discontinue the second preaching service and put all their time and strength and energy into the training of their young men and women for service.

I wish that the brethren could see the letters which I have received during the last two years from men who are asking that very question, and who, as they confront the problem of the second preaching service, are beginning to reach out for the source of future strength and life in their parish and church. As a practical thing, will you let me say, as a part of my own experience for the last four years, I have found the best part of my own ministry has been along this line. Instead of preaching another sermon to people who have already had one, I have asked my church to

let me give all my strength and time to the young people in their Sunday evening service. The result I fully believe will warrant the wisdom of this course in scores and hundreds of churches similar to mine. At any rate, the number of inquiries which come from all parts of the country concerning this very use of strength is some indication of what is going on in the minds of men in the ministry who are struggling after the best ways of using their own time and strength. I see no hope in any large way for the future of the church or the nation or the world, unless it comes through the children—the boys and girls, the young men and women, over whom we have an influence to-day. The older men and women in our churches too often have their own views and political and social habits fixed by long years of custom. Very many ministers find that their influence over the men in their congregation stops short when it comes to Christian ethics in politics and business. The younger men and women, with minds and hearts responsive to the truths of applied Christian life, in the business and Christian world of to-day are the hope of the coming century. If we cannot impress upon them the necessity for a Christian life, what hope can we have of the future for our churches or our country!

It is a wonderful privilege to be a Christian to-day — to be ministers of the gospel of Christ and members of his body. It carries with it to-day a responsibility, together with a privilege, such as disciples did not have fifty years ago. With all the burdens of the life of the present day resting upon us; with all the difficulties which confront us in our church and national life; with all the sin and shame of great cities, of which I am sure we are not often too conscious; with all the spirit of greed which perhaps is the master evil of the day; with all that seems to be discouraging and hopeless as we face the daily conflict of good and bad—there never was so great an age in which to live, and never so wonderful a program as the one which lies before the church of Jesus at the opening of the new century.

God help us to be men who see the facts, who are not afraid of the conflict, who do not hold our places through fear of any man, who are not afraid to put the life of Jesus to the test anywhere; and who, in pulpit or in pew, realize that the church and the ministry of to-day do not mean anything unless they mean the knowledge of opportunities and the use of power to make possible the Kingdom of God in the world. That is what we are here for. May God help us to realize the meaning of the ministry of the new century.